FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 211 *2 November 1981*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/SALT/MBFR

Falin, Chervov View Medium-Range Missile Issue [Riedmueller in Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG 30 Oct] AA 1
U.S. Military Buildup, Disarmament Stance Hit [Antyasov in PRAVDA 26 Oct] AA 2
UK, CSSR Delegates Cited on MBFR Accomplishments AA 5

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Warsaw Pact Military Council Meets in Hungary BB 1
PRAVDA Reports Bucharest Session of CEMA Panel [21 Oct] BB 1
Polish Journalists' Union Attends IOJ Congress [IZVESTIYA 24 Oct] BB 1

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'International Observers Roundtable' Program [Bovin, Shishlin, Levin] CC 1
Antiwar Demonstrations CC 1
U.S. Foreign Policy CC 2
USSR Disarmament Proposals CC 3
Madrid CSCE Meeting CC 4
Vienna Arms Reduction Talks CC 6
Near East Issues CC 7
Brezhnev Visit to FRG CC 7
CSCE Prospects, Interim Results Outlined CC 8
Ilichev Interview 26 Oct [Madrid] CC 8
End of First Week [Kudrin] CC 9
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on NATO Exercise Series [Semenov, 16 Oct] CC 10

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Reagan, Huang Hua 29 October Talks Reported A 1
Bush MIT Speech: 'Hackneyed Allegations' A 1
Haig Speech on World Developments Scored A 2
Haig's Cynical Remarks on Iran Attacked A 2
Kolesnichenko Views Saudi Arabia as 'Bridgehead' [PRAVDA] A 3
'Lies' on Soviet Aid to Terrorists Noted [Knyazov] A 4

CHINA

IZVESTIYA on Taiwan Issue in U.S.-PRC Relations [Agafonov, 23 Oct] B 1
PRAVDA Notes 'Discontent' in PRC Army, Youth [Barakhta, 25 Oct] B 3
Beijing Gaining Access to U.S., NATO Arsenals [Barakhta in PRAVDA 28 Oct] B 5
Message to Supreme Soviet, Council of Ministers B 5

EASTERN EUROPE

Polish Sejm Meets, Discusses Economic Crisis F 1
Session Opens F 1
Olenichev Reports Results F 1
Jaruzelski Address Cited F 2
Washington POST 'Stance' on Poland Criticized F 4
TRYBUNA LUDU Chief Editor Visits PRAVDA F 5
[PRAVDA 21 Oct]
SFRY Delegation Meets Solomentsev, Departs USSR F 5
Moscow Leaders Greet Belgrade on Anniversary F 6
[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 20 Oct]
Ustinov Greetings Message to Romanian Army F 6
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Oct]

WESTERN EUROPE

Leonid Brezhnev Answers DER SPIEGEL Questions G 1
Spanish Vote on Entry Into NATO Criticized [Khabarov] G 11

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

AWACS Viewed in Context of U.S. Mideast Policy H 1
Intelligence for Israel [Trushin] H 1
Threat to Arabs H 1
Motives of U.S. Military Activities in Mideast H 3
Sinai 'Multinational Forces' [Myakishev] H 3
Exercises in Egypt [Korotkov] H 3
PRAVDA Reviews Current Situation in Egypt H 4
[Peresada, 27 Oct]
Soviet-Algerian Trade, Cooperation Outlined H 5

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

PRAVDA Reports Social Science Conference [15 Oct] R 1
Gorshkov Writes in IZVESTIYA on Crimean Battle R 2

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

IZVESTIYA Editorializes on 9-Month Plan Figures [25 Oct] S 1
USSR Will 'Squeeze Economy' for Military Ends S 2
[Wade in London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH 30 Oct]
Dolgikh, Others Attend Coal Industry Conference S 3
[PRAVDA 15 Oct]
New Gas Deposit Discovered in Turkmenia S 3
Briefs: Coal Extraction; Ukraine Nuclear Powerplant S 3

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Radio Reports Agricultural Developments 30 Oct T 1
APN Observer Interviewed on Agriculture T 1
Brezhnev Congratulates Bryanskaya Oblast Workers T 3

FALIN, CHERVOV VIEW MEDIUM-RANGE MISSILE ISSUE

DW302337 Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG in German 30 Oct 81 p 6

[Josef Riedmueller dispatch]

[Text] Moscow, 29 October -- At the beginning of November (next Monday or Tuesday) the Soviet Union will release data about the level of its armament. In so doing it will present an "exact and balanced picture" of the relative military strength of the East and West. This was announced by Valentin Falin, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee's International Information Department and former ambassador to Bonn. Falin could not agree with the West's call for a "zero solution" -- NATO's renunciation of counterarming if the Soviet Union withdraws its SS-20 medium-range missiles.

The Soviet politician made these remarks to a group of West German journalists who are currently in Moscow in connection with the visit Soviet party-state leader Brezhnev is to make to the FRG at the end of November. In recent months -- during the visits by Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] leaders Willy Brandt and Erhard Eppler as well as British Labor Party Chairman Foot, for example -- the Soviet Union several times held out the prospect of publishing exact figures regarding its armament but never went any further. General Chervov, deputy chief of the Soviet General Staff, also answered questions from the West German journalists. He also commented on the USSR's arming itself with SS-20 medium-range missiles. According to American information, 250 of these missiles have already been deployed.

The SS-20's and NATO's Eurostrategic weapons as well as the American Pershing II and cruise missiles will be the central topic at the Soviet-American arms control negotiations which are to begin in Geneva on 30 November. If the Soviet Union does not express its willingness at the Geneva negotiations to dismantle or withdraw its SS-20 missiles, NATO has announced that at the end of 1983 it will begin "counterarming" (deploying 572 Pershing II and cruise missiles in West Europe).

Falin and Chervov's statements point to a tough Soviet stand at the Geneva negotiations. Falin was not able to agree with the West's concept of a "zero solution" because he views the deployment of the SS-20's as the Soviet Union's answer to the U.S. forward-based system (FBS) as well as to England's and France's medium-range missiles. In his eyes the West's "counterarming" is an attempt to achieve arms superiority. He said there were already 1,000 carriers with about 1,500 warheads in the NATO countries. "Why should not there be a counterbalance on the Soviet side?" Falin asked, adding that the actual "zero solution" would be the removal of all medium-range weapons from Europe.

Chervov explained that every missile has a certain service life and that the new SS-20 missiles are of course better than the SS-4 and SS-5 missiles deployed in the fifties and sixties. In this connection, he said, it must be taken into consideration that France and England modernized their medium-range weapons systems by increasing their range and equipping them with multiple warheads. It also had to be taken into consideration that the United States always had 4 or 5 nuclear submarines with 90 missiles stationed in the NATO area. You have to ask yourself, Chervov continued, why the Soviet Union should not be allowed to modernize when the West was doing it. Chervov maintained that the number of launch platforms had not been increased with the modernization of the Soviet weapons systems. He said there was all this talk about increasing numbers of missiles on the Soviet side but it was never mentioned that the old SS-4 and SS-5 missiles were being dismantled at the same time. The total number of launch platforms had not increased, he said. Regarding the total power of all warheads, more were being dismantled than installed. Thus the strategic situation had not been altered.

Chervov also said that the SS-20's were a reaction to the American FBS; it was not true that the Pershing II and cruise missiles were a reaction to the new Soviet systems. The Pershing II and cruise missiles were actually strategic weapons, he said, because they were aimed at strategic targets and at those intercontinental missiles deployed in the European part of the Soviet Union.

Chervov declared further that the Pershing II and cruise missiles could hit and destroy political and military command centers as well as important structures in the Soviet Union. Chervov challenged the Americans "to swear on the Bible" that the Pershing II and cruise missiles would not be targeted against intercontinental missiles in the Soviet Union. If the Americans believe in God, he said, they would not be able to take such an oath. The deputy chief of the General Staff repeated the Soviet contention that the SS-20's could not hit the United States.

Falin maintained that already in 1974 there was agreement between the United States and the FRG to undertake counterarming. The allies of the two countries were not informed of this fact -- at least not at the time, but sometime later. He said that FRG Defense Minister Apel had confirmed that there were no SS-20's at the time. As the source for his information, Falin made indirect reference to a publication which appeared in East Berlin about the activities of Guilleaume, the spy in the chancellor's office.

The former ambassador to Bonn said further that the subject of medium-range weapons was a difficult topic even in the SALT I negotiations. In the Vladivostok agreement the Soviet Union expressed the willingness to exclude American medium-range weapons in Europe and to negotiate on them in SALT III. He said that during party leader Brezhnev's visit to Bonn in May 1978, the Soviet Union had been willing to discuss the subject of gray zone weapons [grauzonen-waffen]. The Soviet side had tried to include a corresponding passage in the final communique but the United States, England and France had prevented it.

Falin complained that American aircraft in Europe loaded with nuclear weapons fly as close as 50 km from the East-West border, causing the Soviet forces to be placed on alert. You could never be certain what was a maneuver and what signaled the beginning of "X-hour." Perhaps the Americans were trying to make the Soviet forces tired and inattentive, he said.

Regarding the negotiations scheduled to be held during Brezhnev's visit to Bonn, Falin said they should not be viewed from a bilateral aspect because they would also concern other countries. The FRG contributed greatly to the existence of NATO's counterarming decision, and it was to be hoped that the FRG would also contribute "as quickly and productively as possible" to results in the German-Soviet negotiations. During the visit of the party chief, he said, the FRG would receive adequate answers from the Soviet Union to its questions so that the Federal Government would be in a position to make decisions.

U.S. MILITARY BUILDUP, DISARMAMENT STANCE HIT

PM301039 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 81 p 6

[M. Antyasov article: "Factor of Trust in Nuclear Age"]

[Text] "We will not necessarily limit our actions.... creating the possibility of expanding war where a potential enemy is most vulnerable does not mean displaying bellicostity" -- that is what U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger says.

This statement by a high-ranking U.S. figure reflects the mood in Washington's military policy thinking. The creation of an atmosphere in international affairs in which the other side feels itself to be in a state of constant tension in the face of possible U.S. actions is extolled as a virtue and viewed as a political "plus." Interpreting this course, the New York TIMES wrote that the principle of "let the Russians sweat a bit" is put foremost.

Let us leave aside the fact that the weapon of the "war of nerves," like any other, is a two-edged one. With this course, concepts like mutual trust, predictability and the absence of suspicion and fear are sacrificed. They are, as it were, discounted. Yet these concepts are of great significance for international relations, especially under the conditions of the nuclear age.

Of course, the background to conflicts between states goes deeper than the mere lack of understanding and trust between them. But at the same time something else is also undoubted: The states' mutual fears, their apprehension in the face of an attack, particularly a surprise attack, have always played the role of a sort of catalyst of military conflicts, accelerating their outbreak.

Historians recognize, for instance, that the kaiser's diplomacy with its constant threats against Germany's neighbors and with its escapades designed for effect such as the famous excursion to Agadir by the Panther [a German warship] created a psychological climate in which the shots of Sarajevo proved enough to start World War II. The outbreak of World War II is inseparable from the atmosphere of blackmail, saber rattling, and intimidation of other countries, which was a component of the policy of German Nazism and Japanese militarism in the prewar years.

But if the factor of confidence has always been important for preserving peace, it has acquired a truly new quality in the nuclear age. That is understandable. First, the very possibility of a surprise attack increases. After all, while formerly months elapsed between the armies' deployment and the beginning of general fighting, now nuclear missile armaments render a strike feasible within a few hours or even minutes. Second, the very threat of the consequences of a military conflict has become immeasurably "weightier." It is a case not of the seizure of particular regions but of the destiny of entire peoples. Third and finally, the existence of nuclear missile weapons makes most substantial the danger of the outbreak of war as the result of an accident or error.

All these are objective realities of the nuclear age. It would seem that such a situation requires that politicians should take particularly considered, thoughtful steps taking into account all the consequences of particular actions which they undertake. As the New York TIMES once wrote, "on the nuclear chessboard it is best to have a clear view of all the pieces."

It cannot be said that the United States does not know that. The U.S. administration constantly talks of the importance of "mutual restraint" and "mutual moderation." But that is just paying lipservice. In reality Washington's present actions are indeed aimed at thickening the atmosphere of mutual suspicion.

Let us begin with the fact that, of itself, the course the United States has now steered toward the uncontrolled buildup of armaments, particularly nuclear armaments, is exerting a destabilizing influence on the entire international atmosphere. After all, it is being said quite openly that the objective of this program is the attainment of military superiority. Quoting official circles, the U.S. press even cites specific deadlines for implementing the "Weinberger plan" -- achieving nuclear superiority over the USSR within 10 years. The author of this plan himself asserts that the modernization and buildup of strategic and nonnuclear forces are essential to the United States in order "to have the opportunity to play the role of world leader."

It is appropriate to ask how the other side should react to these claims. Understandably, such a rearmament program will not remain unanswered but the result for the overall world situation will be an adverse one. As the British newspaper FINANCIAL TIMES rightly noted, "the danger is that the U.S. rearmament program, unrestricted by any framework of arms control, will introduce one more element of instability" to international relations.

It is also important that in the process of the growth of armaments across the Atlantic, types of armaments are being created which substantially enhance the threat of a surprise attack. In this connection mention is made of the effect of increasing the precision of ICBM's, the emergence of missiles with multiple warheads and the tendency toward the miniaturization of nuclear missile weapons and their greater maneuverability. There is no doubt that from this viewpoint the planned deployment of Pershing II missiles in West Europe is truly provocative.

After all, even according to arithmetical calculations, the already brief time separating the start of a nuclear attack from the point when this attack reaches its target is reduced pretty well several times over and the threat of a surprise attack consequently increases many times over. Sober-minded politicians in Europe and the United States are seriously considering this problem. Reflecting their mood, the New York TIMES reasonably wrote regarding plans for the deployment of the Pershing II missiles. "The weapon chosen by the United States in terms of its nature obviously runs counter to the tasks of predictable and stable strategic balance."

Let us take another aspect of the matter -- the choice of military doctrine. Clearly, it predetermines to a considerable extent a state's behavior not only in wartime but also in peacetime and reveals its intentions and influences the overall international situation. Thus, the Schlieffen plan once oriented the kaiser's Germany toward the steering of an aggressive offensive course connected with an overtly cynical attitude toward the rights of other peoples.

If we are speaking of the present U.S. military doctrine, we encounter a highly indicative phenomenon. The new U.S. administration is emphasizing in every way its "pragmatism" in this field and its reluctance to bind itself with any predetermined course in order, as Weinberger put it, "not to restrict our foresight." But the point is precisely that the meaning of this approach does not pursue a cautious, circumspect policy according with the realities and dangers of the nuclear age.

According to the U.S. press, the U.S. military department directives clearly point to the need to create a warfare potential making it possible, even beyond the boundaries of NATO's official sphere of action, "to escalate deliberately to our advantage an emergent conflict." Defense Secretary Weinberger advocates extending or transferring a hypothetical war to other regions, noting that "geographical or horizontal escalation" is one element of the United States' "new strategy." Obviously, as the Washington POST writes, "the result of this new strategy could be not the restraint but the dispersal of any conflict through the unleashing of military operations in any number of regions throughout the world."

Tension in the world is equally increased by the present U.S. administrations's characteristic orientation toward the possibility of "successful" nuclear warfare, if only in its "limited" or so-called "counterforce" variant. True, the U.S. defense secretary denies that "the elaboration of nuclear warfare strategy" can enhance the danger of a conflict. But even a well-known proponent of the use of nuclear weapons like Teller acknowledges "worst of all is the fact that preparatory measures for pursuing a counterforce strategy could be dangerously reminiscent of preparations for a nuclear first strike." Is this not fraught with the danger of increasing the risk of an outbreak of war, including its accidental outbreak?

All this taken together could be viewed as the result of Washington's insufficient consideration of particular consequences of its own actions. However, the entire package of views expressed by U.S. statesmen shows that it is a case of a strategy of deliberate risk, of the readiness, to use the language of Dulles's time, to indulge in "brinkmanship."

That course was already dangerous in the fifties. It is all the more dangerous now -- with the sides' immeasurably increased military, technical pontential and increased arsenal of weapons of mass destruction.

It is no accident that realistic politicians in Europe where, as the New York TIMES notes, fears are mounting over "U.S. cockiness" are sounding the alarm. In this connection the newspaper quotes statements by West German "friends of the United States" pointing out that "in the United States today there is something of Kaiser Wilhelm, meaning by that the catastrophic period of the buildup of German might hallmarked by political ineptness which helped speed up the onset of World War I."

Warning voices are also being heard in the United States. "The U.S. Government's foreign policy has helped to create a more dangerous international climate," Senator Byrd notes, for instance.

A world in the clutches of an atmosphere of mutual fear and suspicion, a world where the danger of war increases many times over -- it is toward this that the strategy of U.S. military policy is actually directing the development of international relations.

The question may arise: But, considering all the present difficulties, is it possible to implement any measures capable of leading us in the opposite direction, toward the easing of mutual suspicions in relations among states belonging to two opposite blocs? All the experience of the past, particularly of the seventies, makes it possible to answer this question in the affirmative. There can be talk of creating an atmosphere of a certain trust in relations between states, of confidence that the other side is not preparing an attack, particularly a nuclear attack, and is not planning any actions which could lead to the fatal destabilization of the international situation.

Properly speaking, the implementation of any measures in the disarmament sphere, all the more so measures of considerable scope, help this. At the same time, the practice of international life also knows steps in the sphere of confidence building. The treaty on the establishment of a direct communication line operating in emergencies was concluded between the USSR and the United States 18 years ago. Since then a number of other steps have been implemented in the same direction. They include in particular confidence-building measures elaborated in Helsinki. Of course, we must proceed further along this path. For instance, tremendous significance would attach to the signing of a declaration entitled "Preventing Nuclear Catastrophe" proclaiming first use of nuclear weapons to be a very grave crime against mankind. "It would be a good thing," Comrade L.I. Brezhnev said recently, "if the U.S. President were to make a clear and unambiguous statement rejecting the very idea of a nuclear attack as criminal."

Naturally, for that good will is needed, as is genuine far-signtedness in politics and concern for peace which is so lacking in the circles which now shape the foreign policy line in Washington.

UK CSSR DELEGATES CITED ON MBFR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

LD292048 Moscow TASS in English 1949 GMT 29 Oct 81

[Text] Vienna, 29 Oct TASS -- A plenary meeting of the participants in the Vienna talks on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe was held today on the eve of the eighth anniversary of the beginning of the talks.

Speaking at a meeting, Britain's representative, trying to sum up the results of the talks over the past eight years attempted to show to the best advantage the West's stand at the talks in Vienna. At the same time, the British delegate had to recognize the real contribution of the socialist countries to the talks. He avoided discussing key problems of the reduction of armed forces and armaments, laying undue emphasis on matching figures of the numerical strength of troops and verification of the implementation of a future agreement.

Speaking at a press-conference, representative of the Czechoslovak delegation said that over eight years of the talks the socialist countries went more than half-way to meet the West. They advanced some twenty compromise proposals of all-embracing or partial nature, aimed at lowering the dangerous level of military confrontation in the centre of the European Continent.

But NATO countries did not give a positive answer to the initiatives of socialist countries, he said. Taking the course at the stepping up of the arms race, they lost interest at achieving an arrangement on the reduction of military potentials and lowering of the level of military confrontation in the centre of Europe, [and] have been seeking to make the talks ineffective. The decision on the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missile means on the territories of European countries, participants in the Vienna meeting, complicated still more the situation in central Europe, [and] threatens to disrupt the existing rough balance of military forces of the Warsaw Treaty countries and NATO countries. All this has a negative effect on the course of the Vienna talks.

WARSAW PACT MILITARY COUNCIL MEETS IN HUNGARY

LD301826 Moscow TASS in English 1707 GMT 30 Oct 81

[Text] Moscow, 30 Oct, TASS -- A meeting of the Military Council of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Treaty member-states was held in the Hungarian People's Republic on October 27-30.

The Military Council was chaired by the Commander-in-Chief of the Joint Armed Forces Marshal of the Soviet Union Viktor Kulikov. Taking part in its work were members of the Military Council and the delegations, headed by them, of the Bulgarian People's Army, the Hungarian People's Army, the National People's Army of the GDR, the Polish Army, the Army of the Socialist Republic of Romania, the Armed Forces of the USSR, the Czechoslovak People's Army and of the Joint Armed Forces' Staff.

The Military Council discussed questions of the current activities of the Joint Armed Forces and adopted recommendations on these questions.

The meeting of the Military Council was held in an atmosphere of friendship, in the spirit of close cooperation and mutual understanding.

PRAVDA REPORTS BUCHAREST SESSION OF CEMA PANEL

PM281515 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Oct 81 p 4

[TASS report: "Committee's Work"]

[Text] The 12th session of the CEMA committee on cooperation in the sphere of material and technical supplies has been held in Bucharest. The leaders of the CEMA countries' central organs of material and technical supplies participated in the session. The USSR delegation was headed by N.V. Martynov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gossnab.

The session participants discussed a range of cooperation measures aimed at realizing the fraternal communist and workers parties' policy of saving and making rational use of material resources as the most important direction in intensifying the CEMA countries' economies. The committee approved the relevant agreements and cooperation programs.

POLISH JOURNALISTS' UNION ATTENDS IOJ CONGRESS

PM281459 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 81 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general headline: "Official Reports"]

[Text] At the Ninth Congress of the International Organization of Journalists in Moscow, the Association of Polish journalists was admitted to membership in the International Organization of Journalists. The delegation had bilateral and multilateral meetings with representatives of the journalists' unions of the USSR, the GDR and other socialist countries, at which questions of mutal cooperation were examined.

INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE PROGRAM

LD012320 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0945 GMT 1 Nov 81

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer; Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS [MEZDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN] journalist, and Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, all-union radio foreign policy commentary]

Antiwar Demonstrations

[Text] [Levin] Hello, esteemed comrade listeners. A week of action for disarmament took place throughout the world between 24 and 31 October. This week is traditonal, and is conducted in keeping with the decision of a special session of the UN General Assembly and the World Peace Council. But one can say with every justification that this time the events which unfurled within the framework of the week surpassed all, even the boldest, expectations. The fact of the matter is not only that the public demonstrations were on a particularly massive scale -- well, it is sufficient to say that in Italy more than 300,000 people took part in the demonstration of peace supporters, one may recall that more than 250,000 people took part in a demonstration in Bonn on 10 September -- but the fact of the matter lies not only in this, the quantity of participants....

[Bovin -- interrupting] And these figures only include the demonstrations in the capital cities.

[Levin] Yes, Yes, the main ones. And I think it is important to note not only the fact that they were on such a massive scale but, in addition, the wide spectrum of the participants in these demonstrations also strikes one's attention. There were representatives of circles of the international public themseleves; there were also -- and this is very significant -- many former important military chiefs of the NATO block among the participants in the demonstrations. And these public demonstrations, the massive scale of these demonstrations, the wide political spectrum of the participants in these demonstrations, show very convincingly the possibilities of public influence on the course of international events.

[Bovin] They can bring appreciable influence to bear, and this is what they are trying to do.

[Levin] And it is impossible not to take this into account. And, I think, even the reaction of the United States of America itself is very noteworthy. At the beginning, America tried to shrug off the demonstrations by the public of the West European countries, although it must be emphasized at once that the week of action for disarmament included not only the European Continent, it was marked literally throughout the world. But, it Western Europe, I should say, it was most apparent, and the Americans tried to shrug it off. Weinberger, the U.S. secretary of defense, set in motion the theory that, allegedly, these are a minority not expressing the mood of all peoples. But, the journal PUBLIC OPINION MAGAZINE conducted a poll which shows very convincingly that the majority of the inhabitants of Western Europe oppose the plans to step up armaments and the plans to deploy new American missiles on West European territory. And I think it is significant that at the same time criticism of Reagan's policy is intensifying in the United States of America itself.

[Shishlin] It is a curious fact that the United States, I would say, has become the involuntary organizer of this antiwar movement. Probably our comrades have noted that, as a rule, whenever there is a statement by Reagan or Weinberger, his secretary of defense, or by General Haig, his chief diplomat, as a rule the antiwar movement in Europe becomes noticeably more active. Well, the Americans themselves, and the American press, call the statements by the Reagan administration inappropriate and confused. But, in my opinion, the fact of the matter here is not that they are inappropriate and confused. They are sufficiently clear. It is a matter of the clear orientation of the United States toward conducting world politics by means of building up its military muscle. However, peace based on fear, peace based on the arms race, peace with an uncontrolled arms race, is, of course, an unsteady peace, a fragile peace, an unstable peace. Europeans do not want such a peace, and not only the Europeans.

U.S. Foreign Policy

[Bovin] If criticism of Regan's policy in America is analyzed, it seems to me that three major trends stand out. In the first place, many observers and journalists note that it is a confused policy. You see, it is characteristic that although a significant period of time has passed since Reagan became President, not once, in any one of his speeches, has he set forth an integrated concept of American foreign policy. His secretaries, his White House staff, make speeches and, quite frequently, their statements do not agree with each other. But it is no coincidence that there are rumors that Haig has quarrelled with Weinberger and someone has quarrelled with someone else. There were rumors recently that Haig was about to be removed and that Weinberger was about to take his place. The White House denies such rumors but, nonetheless, they reflect the muddle prevalent in Reagan's foreign policy.

The second aspect which strikes one's attention is that this attempt to solve the problems of the world by calling on force is unsound in principle because major political problems cannot now be solved, as Nikolay Vladimirovich said, by building up military muscle. This is impossible in principle. You see, political steps are necessary to help untangle these complex political knots.

And last, the third noteworthy aspect is that despite all kinds of hazy statements by the Americans they have nonetheless taken a course toward obtaining military superiority over the Soviet Union. And this course, as many Americans write -- and quite responsible political people at that -- can only end in failure, because the Soviet Union will never allow a situation in which the Americans take the lead.

[Levin] Criticism of Reagan's foreign policy course sometimes contains, I would say, very firm and tough expressions. For example, Malcolm Toon, former U.S. ambassador in the Soviet Union, a career diplomat and a person very well known in the State Department, and not only in the State Department but throughout the United States, recently wrote....

[Bovin -- interrupting] Incidentally, he's someone whom it would be very difficult to suspect of harboring sympathies for the Soviet Union.

[Levin] He did not show them while....

[Bovin] ...No, he did not show them.

[Levin] Malcolm Toon has written the following: If I were asked to classify President Reagan's foreign policy and his national security policy on a 10-point scale, I am afraid that I could give them not more than 3.

[Bovin] That is equivalent to our 1 out of 5, approximately.

[Levin] Maybe slightly more than that.

Here is another comment made in the New York TIMES by Anthony Lewis. He writes: When I look at the strategists in the present administration, I am reminded of the words spoken by the Duke of Wellington when he saw new detachments coming to join his army: I do not know what impression they will make on the enemy but, God be my witness, they terrify me.

[Bovin] So, there is criticism of the President personally and criticism of the policy which he is pursuing or which is being pursued under his aegis.

[Levin] Let us then ask the following question, a very serious question probably: To what extent has this already assumed broad proportions? How will this criticism develop in the future, and what will be the reaction to this criticism:

[Bovin] Here in Moscow it is, of course, quite difficult to judge to what extent this is assuming mass proportions. There is only one thing we can probably say with certainty: This critical trend in the U.S. press is now stronger in tone than during the first part of Reagan's presidency. I would say this with an absolutely clear conscience. It is far more pronounced. But this is the important thing: Will the administration heed these statements? Will it adjust its policy amd make it more reasonable and rational? Well, in general, if you consider concerns common to all men, it is perfectly possible that such a thing could happen, although there is no sign of it at the moment.

[Shishlin] I would only add the following to that. It seems as though the honeymoon in relations between the U.S. Congress and the President which, of course, has been protracted, is passing. It is passing.

[Bovin] The AWACS business is a case in point....

[Shishlin] Yes.

[Bovin] ...Because Reagan can still twist their arms, but only with great difficulty now.

[Shishlin] Yes.

[Levin] Returning once more to our first topic, the week of action for disarmament, I would also like to note the fact that, in general, they have not been able to brush off these events in the United States. Although over there they have indeed tried to somehow distort and twist the meaning of these actions -- generally speaking, and by no means surprising -- the fact that according to official representatives in Washington the mass demonstrations in West Europe have even been discussed at a meeting in the White House is very, very noteworthy.

USSR Disarmament Proposals

In this respect I would like to remind you once more that the week of action for disarmament has shown once again and demonstrated very graphically that the Soviet Union is offering a truly constructive and really thought-out program to resolve all the most complex problems of the present day. This was set out very clearly in the program of peace for the eighties. In the sphere of disarmament we are constantly in the vanguard of the struggle for the solution of the most urgent problems. For example, the United Nations recently published a document which contains a list of 230 disarmament proposals submitted to the United Nations, the Disarmament Committee in Geneva, and other forums by all UN members states ever since this international organization was founded. Eighty of these 230 proposals -- that is, more than a third -- were made by the Soviet Union. These proposals are still in the center of attention today.

A proposal on preventing a nuclear catastrophe has been submitted t the General Assembly session now taking place in New York. This proposal has received further, very powerful political reinforcement in Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's answer to the question of a PRAVDA correspondent. He said that we have never intended to be the first to use nuclear weapons and have never thought of being the first.

[Shishlin] There is, of course, the very interesting question about the extent of influence of the antiwar movement.

I have deliberately returned to this question in the following connection: Namely, the results of the recent elections in Greece where, as you know, antiwar sentiments also increased and where Greek public opinion also had considerable doubts about the transformation of Greece into a bridgehead for the deployment of nuclear weapons. Now these sentiments have, as a matter of fact, led to a victory for, generally speaking, leftwing forces. So today's antiwar movement is a movement with a future.

[Levin] And it is also having a very direct influence on governments. This is a factor which of course deserves great attention.

Madrid CSCE Meeting

But I would now like to talk a bit about an event which attracted attention last week because of the new stage it reached. I am talking about the Madrid meeting of representatives of the participant states in the all-European conference.

[Bovin] Yes, this meeting is a kind of marathon, I would say, because if my memory is not deceiving me, it began on 11 November last year. So it has already lasted for almost a whole year, with recesses. Nevertheless, it is still meeting. Incidentally, it is important that it is still in progress. In spite of all the contradictions and the very heated political debate which has taken place there, this meeting is continuing. If we take the situation as it is at present, the main stumbling-block, so to speak, is probably the following: The meeting is due to make a decision on a European conference on military detente, confidence-building measures and so on.

What has been the hitch up to now? The West demanded that we include all our European territory up to the Urals in the zone where confidence-building measures are applicable because, they said, this is part of Europe. Well, that's logical. It is part of Europe. So we agreed to seek common ground on the Western proposals. In return we naturally expect something from the West. There is no question of course of declaring some part of Canada and the United States, say, as being within this zone, although they did participate in the Helsinki Conference. However, it would be logical to include a certain part of the Atlantic Ocean -- for example, the seas around Europe where fleet movements take place which have material significance for European security -- in this zone in which confidence-building measures are applicable.

Up to now we have not had any clearly-formulated answer from the West. They are neither mooing nor calving, as the saying goes. And so the machinery of the Madrid meeting is now revolving around this issue -- so far without result. For our part we have made a very considerable concession to the West. But we have not yet seen an answering concession. The Madrid meeting is now marking time in this position.

There are also a couple of questions involving the third basket. Given sufficient political will, a way to resolve these can be found. The Americans are saying that some kind of body which would judge how the Helsinki decisions on human rights are being implemented should be set up. They are proposing some kind of multilateral structure, so to speak, along the lines of an international committee of experts, say, or some kind of symposium.

We do not reject in principle the idea of monitoring the implementation of these decisions, but we are saying that from the point of view of getting things done, from the point of view of effectiveness, it would be far better if this were conducted on a bilateral basis. If the Americans, are willing, let us discuss these questions with them, or with the British or French. This will be a more specific dialogue where the arguments will be listened to in a more specific fashion, so to speak. That is where the sides differ. Should it be multilateral or bilateral. Well, we will see whether there is enough political will to find a mutually-acceptable solution.

There are also an ther couple of questions, perhaps already less complex. Once again I wish to say that the enormous work done in Madrid over the whole year should not pass fruitlessly and one would wish that in the end all these debates -- very heated and (?sometimes) very complex -- would lead to some positive decisions so important to Europe now, especially, and I say "especially" because the Americans are, as everyone knows, now adopting an altogether unconstructive position. In my opinion, it is this unconstructive position that most of all inhibits the course of the Madrid meeting.

[Shishlin] Diplomats in Madrid consider something like 80 percent of the work in Madrid as having been completed. Another 20 percent of the work remains to be done. Of course, such calculations are perhaps not allrevealing. And this new round of the Madrid meeting is scheduled to last 7 weeks, so the diplomats have sufficient time.

I simply would like to add that the very idea of a European conference on confidence-building measures and military detente belongs to the Soviet Union. This is a Soviet initiative. Subsequently it was developed in the French proposal -- incidentally, approved by NATO. All the NATO members are holding on to this French proposal. It comprises four points. The first point is that the conference must limit itself to discussing proposals of genuine military significance. Second, that proposed measures should be obligatory and based on the principle of voluntary execution. And fourth, this is the extension of confidence-building measures over the territory of the whole of Europe and, as concerns the Soviet Union, over the whole territory up to the Urals.

[Levin] This is something which, strictly speaking, goes beyond the framework of the Helsinki to some degree.

[Bovin] Yes, it unquestionably extends the agreed....

[Shishlin -- interrupting] This step was taken at the 26th Congress when the Soviet Union declared its good will.

[Bovin] And at the same time it was stressed that the West should also show a certain amount of good will.

[Shishlin] There is this detail: The Soviet Union does not demand that the West immediately announce which additional zone it is prepared to include in the zone to be covered by the confidence-building measures. The Soviet Union considers that the West can work out its position and announce it directly at the all-European conference on military detente and disarmament.

[Bovin] We have a very flexible position, and, given even a minimal wish to opt for a real solution of these problems, the West should have accepted it. But regrettably this has not happened yet.

[Levin] Incidentally, this also concerns the problem of human rights to a certain degree. We have never avoided discussing these problems, but we stress that the discussion of these very important problems must be freed from demagogy and must concern fundamental human rights. Yes, there are different interpretations of human rights in the capitalist countries and in the socialist states. We approach these problems differently. But one should not turn this into a weapon for confrontation. This is one of the very important questions. And when we talk of Madrid and we say that this meeting has been dragging on a little bit, we nevertheless consider that if there are positive results, then the time spent on this meeting will justify itself fully.

Vienna Arms Reduction Talks

However, together with this, one recalls different talks which have been going on for 8 years. It was 8 years ago on 30 October that the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments, began, and this delay cannot be viewed positively.

[Bovin] How can there be anything positive when for 8 years they have been pointlessly thrashing about? But perhaps that is not the whole story. Certain small steps toward finding common ground have been made, and what I want to say in general is that we have displayed the maximum possible flexibility if you add up the latest proposals of the socialist countries. But the whole point is that when we accept a Western proposal, the West immediately begins to back-pedal or amends it with certain reservations which make it unacceptable.

For instance, everyone is agreed that the first phase of the reduction of troops and armaments should relate to Soviet and U.S. troops. They proposed it and we proposed it. But, we say: Yes, fine, we will carry out this first phase, but let us at least in principle agree now that we shall not stop at the first step and that subsequent steps on a wider scale, so to speak, will follow, involving troops and armaments of other states. Let us, at least for the period in which we are taking this step, freeze the existing levels, something which seems quite logical.

However, our Western opponents do not wish to accept these proposals. Moreover, they have put forward an amendment to the effect that, yes, let's assume we start this first phase of reductions, but even at that stage we will take concomitant measures. as they have elegantly formulated it. What does this mean? It means an inspection which would not only check the reduction of troops and armaments but large-scale maneuvers on the territory of the Soviet Union, which does not naturally come under the central European zone.

Naturally, we cannot agree to such far-reaching proposals, which, strictly speaking, lie outside the framework of the Vienna talks. And this is the reason for all this marking of time.

In addition, they are saying that even the first phase of the reductions must not begin until an absolute agreement is reached on the figures, and as experience has shown one can also argue about these endlessly. We give them our official figures and they say no, they have different figures; after all, we are not going to go out and count every soldier and every gun. It would seem that one side should trust the other in exchanging data. But they just refuse to agree to that.

[Levin] And the Vienna talks, perhaps, confirm once again that a dialogue, a productive dialogue is possible only if both sides have an honest and sincere approach to the talks, if they desire to arrive at mutual understanding. Although, of course, in the modern world there is no sensible alternative to dialogue, and this is the sole possible, the sole realistic avenue to the solution of the problems which face humanity, these attempts by the Western powers sometimes to dodge the solution of problems behind the instrument of the talks is quite evident in Vienna, it seems to me.

[Bovin] Moreover, the point is not that a dialogue is needed there, that is obvious. But what is necessary is somehow to seek a compromise solution, which is indispensable. It is obviously clear to everyone that we cannot defend our position 100 percent, and the Americans, and the Westerners as a whole, cannot either. And so what is needed -- this is what the art of diplomacy, of the politicians, consists of in such a case -- is to attempt to sound out positions which suit both sides. I say again that we are displaying the maximum possible flexibility in this respect. Unfortunately, their position has hitherto been much tougher, and in this sense much less constructive.

[Shishlin] A thoroughly risky idea, incidentally, is being prepared in Washington at the present time: that of combining the Vienna talks on the reduction of arms and armed forces in central Europe with the talks on the limitation, the curtailment of the medium-range nuclear missile race in Europe. Well, this attempt, without having resolved one matter, to link it with another unresolved matter, of course almost totally dooms to failure all political efforts to untie these complex knots.

[Bovin] It seems to me that this is as yet just a general idea, so to speak; it has not yet been expressed in anything specific, but it really is an undeniably dangerous trend.

Near East Issues

[Levin] Well, although we are talking about Europe at the moment, I think one is quite justified in saying that the principle of such talks, in which the interests, the legitimate, reasonable interests of all the sides must be taken into account, has a bearing on one of the world's very hot spots, a spot which has recently become even hotter: the Near East.

In this connection, of course, very widespread ripples were produced by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's recent statement, in which he called for the convocation of an international conference on the Near East. This proposal was advanced at the 26th party congress, but Leonid Ilich Brezhnev has now elaborated somewhat on it: He stressed on 27 October that at such a conference, together with all Arab countries which have a common border with Israel, and Israel itself, the PLO should also without fail take part on an equitable footing. Together with the Soviet Union and the United States, other states representing, so to speak, the regions adjoining the Near East -- West Europe, North Africa and South Asia, for example -- could also take part. This proposal opens up real prospects both for an attenuation of tension in the Near East and, at last, a way out of the impasse created by Camp David, which has aggravated the situation in this region; the situation there really does remain very complex.

[Shishlin] You said that the hot situation is getting hotter and hotter. That is true. The situation there really is so hot that you could fry pancakes; well, the pancakes are for the moment being fried by the United States and Israel.

[Levin] But they are frequently burning their pancakes.

[Bovin] It's not their first pancake, but it still hasn't come out properly: that is how I'd put it. The whole point, and this is of course my own view, is that I think that until Israeli troops are withdrawn from Sinai there will be no substantial changes there. And when the Israelis have left Sinai it will be interesting to take a look at Egypt's policy. Of course, many statements of all kinds are currently being made there to the effect that everything will be unchanged. Well, by and large, politics shows that today there may be declarations of one kind, and tomorrow of another, so that it may be said with a certain amount of justification that we should wait until the Israelis leave Sinai, for there may be a new wind of some kind blowing there -- although, as I say, for the moment I am just thinking out loud.

[Shishlin] Yet, for the time being there are attempts to preserve the status quo. And drastic measures are being used for this. These drastic measures include: the continuing campaign of arrests in Egypt, which, as is well known, has seized the army; the airlift of troops to its western borders by Sudan; the sale to Saudi Arabia of five AWACS aircraft fitted with the AWACS system, by the United States.

[Levin] In the framework of very large-scale arms sales totalling $8 billion.

[Bovin] It is typical of the Americans, yet again, that they believe that this complex political knot can be resolved by building up their military presence in the Near East. This is an utterly dead-end option; it does not solve the political problems, and yet they keep hitting their heads against the same brick wall.

Brezhnev Visit to FRG

[Shishlin] A major speech was recently delivered at a conference, or rather congress, of the Committees for the Defense of the revolution by Fidel Castro. He said that we are living at the most dangerous time in the history of mankind. This idea is doubtless true, but it can be qualified slightly: We are also living at a time when there are also may be the greatest opportunities for mankind to resolve the issue of war and peace in the manner in which it should be resolved -- that is, in favor of peace.

[Levin] A specific confirmation of this is provided by the great expectations being attached to the forthcoming visit by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev to the FRG. A statement by the Presidium of the Board of the German Communist Party stresses that working people are expecting fresh steps in the interests of detente from the meeting between the leaders of the two states in Bonn, and it is very interesting that, talking about his conversation with Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, after returning from his recent trip to the Soviet Union, North Rhine-Westphalia Minister-President Rau stressed that the Soviet call for peace is very serious, and our policy is clearly meeting with an increasingly widespread response. And many see it as that stablizing and constructive element which make it possible to settle the problems facing mankind.

Our time is up. Thank you for your attention, esteemed comrades. All the best!

CSCE PROSPECTS, INTERIM RESULTS OUTLINED

Ilichev Interview 26 Oct

PM301055 Madrid ABC in Spanish 27 Oct 81 p 23

[Unattributed report on 26 October EFE interview in Madrid with Leonid Ilichev, head of the Soviet delegation to the CSCE conference: "Conditions Exist for Positive Conclusion to Meeting"]

[Text] The head of the Soviet delegation to the CSCE conference, Deputy Foreign Minister Leonid Ilichev, told EFE yesterday, on the eve of the resumption of proceedings, that "the most important thing is to concentrate all efforts on concluding the Madrid meeting with the adoption of a substantial document embracing all sections of the Final Act."

[Question] With what prospects is the Madrid CSCE meeting resuming, after the recess that began 28 July?

[Answer] We believe that all the objective conditions -- I stress the adjective objective -- exist for a positive conclusion to the meeting.

[Question] In your opinion, is it to be expected that the international situation will be resolved and therefore that the Madrid conference will achieve substantial results on all clauses of the Final Act?

[Answer] The Madrid conference is in itself a factor that exerts a certain influence on the international situation. Its success will facilitate the relaxation of tension and the strengthening of security and cooperation. And this is particularly important bearing in mind the emergence of the well-known plans to turn the European Continent into a theater of conflict.

[Question] What initiatives does your country intend to promote in this new stage of the meeting?

[Answer] It is well known that the Soviet Union has promoted many major peaceful initiatives that open the way to a successful conclusion of the Madrid meeting; now the West must respond.

[Question] What are the essentials for the conference to end its proceedings successfully -- in other words, the adoption of a substantial document embodying progress along the path laid down by the 1975 Final Act?

[Answer] The existing of the political will on the part of all participants without exception to achieve success at the Madrid meeting, the desire to achieve jointly agreed solutions, not unilateral advantages. There is no other way.

[Question] Would you consider it a failure if the conference ended its proceedings with the adoption of a document as limited as the one adopted in Belgrade in 1978?

[Answer] The most important thing is to concentrate all efforts on concluding the Madrid meeting with the adoption of a substantial final document embracing all sections of the Final Act. This is the specific mandate with which the Soviet delegation arrived in Madrid.

End of First Week

LD311816 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 31 Oct 81

[Correspondent Igor Kudrin report from Madrid]

[Text] The first working week of the meeting of the participant states of the all-European Conference on Cooperation and Security [CSCE] has ended. The delegations of the Soviet Union and the socialist states have immediately undertaken concrete steps aimed at the successful conclusion of this international forum. Our country's position was clearly presented in a speech by Comrade Ilichev, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs. The Soviet Union is making great efforts to ensure the success of the Madrid meeting, from which the peoples await concrete results and a fitting contribution to the cause of strengthening security and the development of cooperation in Europe, said the head of the Soviet delegation. He proposed that all delegations should conduct the forthcoming work at a businesslike pace without artificial delays or procrastination and above all resolve the issue of the convocation of a conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe.

But it seems that the delegations of a number of NATO countries are prepared to hold discussions on any subject except questions relating to security on the European Continent. General surprise was caused among observers, for instance, by the speech of the British representative in which, without proposing anything new, he launched a tirade of preposterous attacks on the Soviet Union. On the same day, the British representative was supported by the head of the U.S. delegation. And so what we are clearly witnessing are fresh attempts by the West to complicate the proceedings of the meeting and to push it toward an impasse.

By all accounts, the sessions in the Madrid palace will be strenuous. And yet one would like to believe that the interests of peace, detente and mutual understanding will gain the upper hand over the shortsighted policy of confrontation.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA ON NATO EXERCISE SERIES

PM29[illegible]719 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Oct 81 p 3

[Col I. Semenov article: "The Origin of the Threat -- the Provocative Trend of the U.S. and NATO Armed Forces' Maneuvers"]

[Text] With the R. Reagan administration's advent to power, the desire began to predominate in U.S. and NATO policy to gain a "position of strength" and demonstrate it constantly to the whole world. A special place is assigned here to military maneuvers and exercises.

The myth of the "Soviet military threat" is being intensively fanned to validate the "need" for such exercises and for other militarist actions. "...The unhindered growth of Soviet military might must, in due course, completely paralyze the West's policy," U.S. Secretary of State A. Haig predicts. "The Soviet Union's overall military potential presents a serious threat to the West," U.S. Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger says, intimidatingly.

While holding provocative militarist demonstrations, the U.S. and NATO leadership tries at the same time to assert that the maneuvers and exercises organized in the West are exclusively defensive in character. They are presented so as to suggest that they ostensibly have no task other than improving the forces' combat training.

Diverse questions of the movement, transfer and deployment of units and divisions, the conduct of battles and operations, coordination, the improvement of administration, communications and troops' material and technical backup are undoubtedly developed on U.S. and NATO armed forces' exercises, as within all armies. If one analyzes the U.S. and NATO exercises' character, however, it becomes clear that their aim goes far beyond the limits of defense -- they bear a vividly expressed aggressive character.

The number of exercises is increasing from year to year. According to NATO plans, about 200 are conducted during 1 year. Furthermore, 600-700 exercises are held under national command plans.

They are acquiring an increasingly global character. It has become the rule to conduct many exercises simultaneously on the territory of a number of states, embracing the USSR and other socialist countries in a gigantic semicircle of militarist demonstrations. They are often linked by a unity of design and by a general operational-strategic backdrop. Simultaneously with NATO's "Autumn Forge-81" maneuvers, for example, the "Ocean Venture-81" exercises of the bloc's combined naval forces and the U.S.-Japanese maneuvers in the Sea of Japan and East China Sea region were held, with 90 warships, as many aircraft again and about 16,000 servicemen participating from the Japanese side alone.

The scale and duration of the exercises are steadily increasing. The U.S. strategic nuclear forces' exercises of the Global Shield type are on a particularly large scale. AP reported that 100,000 servicemen and 800 warplanes participated in this exercise in 1981. All the components of the triad of strategic offensive forces ICBM's, nuclear missile submarines and Strategic Air Command were involved in it as well as naval ships and aircraft, Marine units, the Air Force Reserve, the National Guard, U.S. air transport and Canadian Armed Forces.

The duration of these exercises was 20 days. As was officially stated, these were "the largest and most comprehensive ever strategic readiness exercises." They practiced nuclear strikes from the air and by land-based ICBM's, naval operations and marine landings. Strategic air force flights were made over U.S. territory (including Alaska) and Canada and over the Atlantic, Pacific and Indian Oceans. There were realistic ICBM launches, nuclear submarines were at their departure points and strategic aircraft took to the air.

In the series of large-scale exercises, a special place is also assigned to NATO's fall maneuvers entitled "Autumn Forge." They comprise several dozen exercises and are carried out over a vast area from Norway to Turkey as well as on the seas around Europe and in the Atlantic.

They last approximately 2-2.5 months. According to a statement by Gen B. Rogers, supreme commander, NATO Allied Armed Forces, Europe, about 300,000 servicemen from 13 bloc member-countries are participating in these maneuvers this year. Thousands of tanks and aircraft, hundreds of warships and much other combat hardware have been brought into action. It is characteristic that, although the present maneuvers are at the level of past years in terms of the number of personnel and armaments, the combat might of the army and navy forces participating in them has noticeably increased. Thus for the first time, two U.S. aircraft carriers, the Eisenhower and the Forrestal, participated at the same time in the "Magic Sword" exercises, which are a constituent of the "Autumn Forge-81" series. The number of troops shipped from U.S. and British territory to boost the NATO armed forces groups in Western Europe increased. Whereas, for example, about 12,000 U.S. soldiers and 1,000 tons of freight were shipped to FRG territory for the 1978 exercises, about 17,000 men and 27,000 tons of freight were shipped out for this year's exercises, according to Western press figures.

The naval maneuvers are becoming increasingly large, too. According to a New York TIMES report, 120,000 servicemen, 250 ships and nearly 1,000 warplanes participated in the "Ocean Venture-81" exercises, for example. It is taking place in the south and north Atlantic, the Caribbean and the Baltic. Naval forces from some Latin American states are operating in this exercise together with the NATO countries' fleets.

The joint NATO naval and air force exercise entitled "Ocean Safari-81" was large in scale, too. Dozens of national naval headquarters and NATO joint commands in the Atlantic and Europe, over 19,000 servicemen, over 80 warships, about 300 aircraft, marine units and forces and facilities of the Atlantic and northern zones of the NATO joint air defense force system in Europe participated in it. The Western press has reported that in addition to other tasks, questions were worked out at this exercise connected with bolstering NATO's naval force groups in regions of the eastern Atlantic and the English Channel zone and that marine landing operations were conducted.

Attention is drawn to the fact that, like other independent naval and air force exercises, these are directly connected to exercises on the European Continent both in their timing and in the tasks being fulfilled. The New York TIMES notes that the "Ocean Venture-81" maneuvers, for example, were as close as could be to combat operations at sea for which the Pentagon has formulated a plan in the event of waging a lengthy war in Europe.

The U.S. and NATO exercises have a provocative and clearly expressed anti-Soviet trend. The regions for holding them are chosen close to the borders of the USSR and other socialist countries. Air flights are made toward them and land and air force groups targeted for action against them are established. Thus, in the "global shield-81" exercises, 400 strategic aircraft were put into the air simultaneously which imitated nuclear strikes against targets on USSR territory. According to a statement by a spokesman for the U.S. Air Force Strategic Air Command, this group ascent into the air was unprecedented in the U.S. strategic air force's 35-year history. It was not without reason that the public rated the "Global Shield-81" exercises a major act of provocation and flagrant "nuclear blackmail."

However, this is also the character of other maneuvers organized by the Pentagon. The U.S. militarist activity in the Mediterranean and Near East regions is indicative in this respect. Thus an exercise was carried out by the U.S. 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean in September during which two Libyan patrol aircraft were shot down. The new 6th Fleet maneuvers, hastily organized off the coast of Libya, as well as the preparation for major U.S.-Egyptian maneuvers on Egyptian territory are related to the U.S. intrigues in this region, which have been stepped up particularly in connection with the recent events in Egypt.

As a rule, the plans behind the exercises are based on the fallacious concept of the sudden launching of war by the Warsaw Pact countries' armed forces. In the U.S. and NATO leadership's opinion, such a "scenario" should intensify anti-Soviet feelings among armed forces personnel and the civilian population.

An offensive, aggressive character is typical of U.S. and NATO exercises and maneuvers. According to Western press data, real military plans are checked out in them. Great attention is paid to preemptive nuclear strikes by strategic facilities and to alternatives for using the new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles, planned for deployment on West European countries' territory, and for the neutron weapons whose mass production has begun in the United States. The use of troops in line with the planned redeployment of U.S. and FRG Armed Forces nearer the GDR borders is being assessed.

Great attention is being paid to the practical verification of the strategy of "limited nuclear war" in Europe. This task is being tackled, in particular, during the "Autumn Forge" maneuvers.

Questions of the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons are being resolved increasingly actively during the exercises. So as to hide the preparation for chemical and bacteriological war, an unbridled slanderous campaign has been launched in the West against the Soviet Union, asserting that the USSR and its allies are using toxic chemical agents in Laos, Kampuchea and Afghanistan.

Practice in air and sea landings to capture areas of sea coast, the crossing of water obstacles in force and other types of offensive actions is being expanded in the exercises.

All this makes it possible to assert that the large-scale U.S. and NATO army and navy exercises are extremely aggressive actions, essentially rehearsals for nuclear war. This is why they are a great threat to stability and peace in Europe and throughout the world.

By their scale and anti-Soviet trend, the exercises being conducted by the United States and NATO do not accord with the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act and intensify international tension. They contradict the peoples' vital interests. Increasingly loudly the voice of the world public says "no to the imperialist forces' dangerous plans."

As for the Soviet Union, together with the other socialist community countries and all peace-loving forces, it is waging a tireless struggle to deepen detente, oppose the arms race and avert war. "There is now no task more important on the international plane for our party, our people and indeed for all the world's peoples," Comrade L.I. Brezhnev stated from the 26th CPSU Congress rostrum, "than to defend peace."

The USSR has put forward a broad range of peace initiatives. An important place among them is occupied by the proposals on confidence-building measures; notification of major naval and air force exercises as well as of movements of land forces of over 20,000 men to a region defined in the Final Act; and increasing the deadline for notification of exercises by land forces from 21 days to 1 month, and from the 20,000-man level, not 25,000 as now. The Soviet Union is calling for the scale of exercises to be restricted and for them not to be conducted with more than 40,000-50,000 men. It has also proposed a substantial expansion of the zone of application of confidence-building measures and has expressed a readiness to extend them to the entire European part of the USSR -- conditional upon a corresponding expansion of the zone of confidence-building measures on the Western states' part. The Soviet Union has put forward an initiative to hold specific talks on confidence-building measures with all interested countries in the Far East, too.

U.S. and NATO imperialist circles are stubbornly opposing these measures, including that of restricting the scale of exercises. This is understandable. Implementing the USSR's proposals does not fit into the framework of their aggressive foreign policy course. The U.S. and NATO leadership views large-scale exercises as a most important means of achieving military superiority and of safeguarding U.S. imperialism's claims to world supremacy. In the imperialist circles' view, the exercises are intended to create and maintain a state of tension in Europe and throughout the world so as to achieve even closer unity within NATO, egg the U.S. allies on to increase their military spending and stifle the West European public's growing protests against the plans to deploy the new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe and to produce neutron weapons.

The organizers of the exercises are pursuing the aim of pressuring the USSR and influencing the situation in the socialist community countries, primarily in Poland, in the direction which they require.

These attempts are futile. The policy of threats from a "position of strength" will not bring its inspirers success. Pursuing a peace-loving policy, the Soviet Union is vigilantly following the imperialist forces' intrigues and strengthening its defense capability. The socialist countries possess everything necessary to defend their peoples reliably.

REAGAN, HUANG HUA 29 OCTOBER TALKS REPORTED

LD301130 Moscow TASS in English 1023 GMT 30 Oct 81

[Text] Washington, 30 Oct, TASS -- Huang Hua, the foreign minister of the People's Republic of China, began talks in Washington on Thursday. He had a White House meeting with President Reagan and met Vice President Bush, Secretary of State Haig and Defense Secretary Weinberger. According to statements made by officials, one of the main subjects of discussion is American arms deliveries to China.

After the meeting between President Reagan and Huang Hua, an official spokesman for the White House told pressmen that they had a "warm, friendly and sincere" exchange of opinions and reached agreement on the basic issues of the international situation. They also found a common language on the question of the so-called "Soviet menace". The President and Huang Hua stressed also the importance of development of American-Chinese relations. These relations are now moving toward the establishment of a Washington-Beijing axis, a component part of the aggressive military alliance in eastern Asia, which is being knocked together under the U.S. aegis.

BUSH MIT SPEECH: 'HACKNEYED ALLEGATIONS'

LD312056 Moscow TASS in English 2007 GMT 31 Oct 81

[Text] Washington, 31 Oct, TASS -- Speaking on Friday at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Vice-President of the United States George Bush tried to conceal real reasons for a flare-up of anti-American sentiments in Western Europe. Grossly distorting the generally known facts, he tried to present anti-nuclear protests in Western Europe as an annoying misunderstanding of little consequence, a result of "Moscow's intrigues". He tried to substantiate his ludicrous "conclusion" by stating that the rhetoric of the participants in the protests is similar to the line conducted by TASS and PRAVDA.

George Bush again resorted to the hackneyed allegations about "Soviet menace", was ascribing to the Soviet Union aggressive intentions and the striving to impose its domination on Western Europe, if not by military seizure, then by nuclear blackmail.

Bush was trying to create the impression that the only "salvation" for Western Europe is to agree to the deployment on its territory of about 600 new U.S. nuclear missiles and went so far as to allege that this will "compel" the Soviet Union to start talks on U.S. terms.

By all indications, official Washington is much alarmed by the growth of anti-war sentiments. The Washington POST writes that just as the anti-war movement late in the sixties did much toward undermining the semblance of unanimous support by the U.S. people for the war in Vietnam, the impression that was sought by the then President of the United States Lyndon Johnson, the present wave of protests in Europe might disrupt the planned build-up of NATO nuclear forces.

The protests against Washington's dangerous militaristic plans are growing in the United States, too. A vivid sign of this was an anti-war demonstration of many thousands that was held in front of the building of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology when George Bush was speaking there. The demonstrators demanded an end to the arms race which carries the world to a catastrophe, demanded that the plans of turning Western Europe into the Pentagon's nuclear range be abandoned.

HAIG SPEECH ON WORLD DEVELOPMENTS SCORED

LD301738 Moscow TASS in English 1646 GMT 30 Oct 81

[Text] Washington, 30 Oct, TASS -- Speaking at the State Department yesterday, U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig touched upon the question of the anti-war movement in Western Europe, which has assumed a particularly broad scope in connection with Reagan's statement that a "limited" nuclear war was possible on the European Continent. Haig said that it is important for the USA to recognize the real character of that movement in Europe. Thus, the secretary of state was forced to forego the Washington's propaganda cliches which are an attempt at picturing the anti-nuclear actions in the West European countries of being orchestrated by Moscow.

The U.S. secretary of state again slandered Cuba's policy and unfoundedly charged it with increasing "subversion and terrorism in the Western Hemisphere." Meanwhile, it is common knowledge that it is none other than the USA which is engaged in subversive activity against Cuba, Nicaragua, Grenada and a number of other Central American and Caribbean states. It is the Cuban people which is faced with all sorts of challenges and provocations on the part of imperialism.

The U.S. secretary of state said that Washington had just completed revising its policy vis-a-vis Cuba, adding that before the President took final decisions he would not like to speak about any specific plans. It is an open secret, however, that there has been talk in Washington recently about such a "revision" of the anti-Cuban policy of the U.S. administration that would provide for its further toughening, evidence of which is the establishment in Florida of a subversive piratic radio station, whose programmes are beamed to Cuba. Haig once again mentioned Cuba in connection with the presence of Cuban units in Angola, where they stay at the request of the government of that country, which is a victim of aggression of the racist South African regime. He claimed that this fraternal internationalist aid of Cuba to Angola is alledgedly an obstacle for the attainment of independence by Namibia.

The state secretary has thus presented things in a totally distorted light. The whole world knows that Namibia's territory is occupied by the South African military, who use it as a staging area for bandit attacks against Angola and other "frontline" states in the south of Africa. The continuation of this occupation would be impossible, had it not been for the practical backing of Pretoria by some Western countries, above all by the USA.

Touching upon the Middle East situation, Haig was again speaking of a "strategic consensus" of an anti-Soviet character, which, in his words, had already existed for some time. Meanwhile, many figures among Arab political circles consider the idea of "consensus" to be stillborn for the simple reason that the countries of that region, including the so-called "moderates," justly believe that the threat to security and peace in the Middle East region stems from Israel and not from the Soviet Union. This has been repeatedly pointed out by the leaders of Jordan and other Arab states.

Speaking on American-Chinese relations, the secretary of state stressed that the Reagan administration is ready to consider China's request for arms supplies. This policy is a source of serious concern for the countries of South-East and South Asia, towards which Beijing is hatching far-reaching hegemonistic, aggressive plans.

HAIG'S CYNICAL REMARKS ON IRAN ATTACKED

LD302050 Moscow TASS in English 1905 GMT 30 Oct 81

[Text] Washington, 30 Oct, TASS -- Addressing editors of American newspapers the U.S. Secretary of State Haig, cynically stated that the Reagan administration was pursuing such a policy in respect to Iran that would lead to the establishment in Iran of a moderate regime compatible with the interests and values of the United States.

This unceremonious statement by the head of the U.S. diplomatic establishment is by no means the first of its kind. In one of his recent statements the very same Haig spoke haughtily of Iran as a country where "chaos" reigns. Such statements are an expression of the arrogant and rude interference of the American administration and personally the secretary of state in the internal affairs of a sovereign Islamic country.

It is an open secret that Washington would like the restoration in Iran of orders that existed under the monarchy that was overthrown by the people and played the role of U.S. policeman in the Near and Middle East.

This course reflects the imperial claims of the Reagan administration to American leadership of the world. To attain these imperialist aims the United States has concentrated a naval armada in the Indian Ocean, created the interventionist Rapid Deployment Force and is building up its military presence in the Middle East situated thousands of kilometres from American shores. The Reagan administration is expanding arms deliveries to this already explosive region, is openly engaged in sabre-rattling, holding one military exercise after another and openly threatening the security and sovereignty of the states of that area of the world.

KOLESNICHENKO VIEWS SAUDI ARABIA AS 'BRIDGEHEAD'

LD3011?0 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0350 GMT 30 Oct 81

[Tomas Kolesnichenko 30 October PRAVDA "commentary": "On the Path of Interference"]

[Text] The U.S. Senate has approved, by 52 votes against 48, one of the biggest military deals, worth $8.5 billion -- the sale to Saudi Arabia of military equipment, including 5 AWACS aircraft. Thus, Washington has taken yet another step on the path of intensifying tension in the Near and Middle East and of consolidating its constant military presence in that part of the world. To conceal these unseemly facts, a grandiose show was played out around the voting in the Senate where, through the American press, events were presented as though those on Capitol Hill viewed the clash as only between two lobbies -- the pro-Israeli, which was against the deal, and the pro-Arab, which was for it. Moreover, the Democrats supposedly wanted to inflict the first appreciable blow against Reagan's prestige, as a result of which the President's authority was put on the line. In the best traditions of an American detective story, the American public was given up-to-the-minute details on the dramatic details of the deal: arm-twisting of senators by the White House, their contradictory statements, changes of position, and such.

In reality, all those taking part in the show obtained what they wanted, as its organizers had originally planned. The pro-Israeli lobby has been reassured by the President's statement that the United States pledges to defend Israel's security. The AWACS system will, effectively, be under direct American control, not to mention the innumerable advisers who will now be sent to Saudi Arabia. The Pentagon had planned this from the very outset.

All this means an intensification of direct U.S. military presence in the Near East. The deliveries of military equipment to Saudi Arabia are explained by the far-reaching strategic plans of the United States. In the view of the American press, Saudi Arabia is regarded by Washington as a kind of second Iran. It is known that the United States and Israel banked on the shah's Iran as a policeman for the region, and precisely for that purpose provided the shah with the most up-to-date weapons for use both against the Iranian people and against progressive Arab regimes.

All the indications are that the United States would now like to prepare Saudi Arabia for the role of bridgehead, as is shown by the passions in Washington over the AWACS deal. This would threaten the interests of the Arab peoples and the cause of peace in the region.

'LIES' ON SOVIET AID TO TERRORISTS NOTED

LD311158 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0630 GMT 31 Oct 81

["Provocative Accusations" -- TASS headline; by TASS commentator Maksim Knyazov]

[Text] Moscow, 31 Oct (TASS) -- The United States administration is making feverish efforts to save the failing campaign of lies which accuse the Soviet Union of being a "patron of international terrorism." Recently U.S. Vice President G. Bush came out with the latest fabrications on this subject.

In an interview just published by the Japanese journal FOCUS, he again brought up the old falsehood that the USSR is "training and supplying" Arab "terrorists." He naturally did not give any proof of what he said since none exists. At the same time the former chief of the CIA let it be understood that he can reach the same conclusion concerning support given by the Soviet Union to the Palestine Liberation Organization.

As is known, the PLO is recognized by the United Nations Organization as the only legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine, which is fighting the Israeli occupiers for the foundation of their own state on their native soil. However, this fact in no way hinders the United States from sticking the label of "terrorist organization" on the United Nations. [as received]

Disproving this malicious falsehood, Y. 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee, said in a recent interview with the Austrian paper ARBEITER-ZEITUNG: "We are not terrorists but an organization fighting the Israeli occupiers.... We consider terrorism a crime." However, the U.S. vice president evidently did not wish to listen to these words. His reason is well-known. The present Washington administration is trying to identify all national liberation movements in the world with terrorism. As a result of this "concept," the United States is sending U.S. arms and "advisers" to El Salvador for the suppression of the popular uprising there and is strengthening political, economic and military links with the racist Republic of South Africa regime, which is trying to drown in blood the actions of patriots both within the country and on the territory of illegally occupied Namibia. The antipopular, terrorist nature of such a course cannot be doubted.

Another thing is noteworthy: Behind the provocative accusations of the Soviet Union "being the patron of international terrorism" is evidently hidden an attempt by ruling U.S. circles to force the USSR to abandon support for the just struggle of peoples for freedom and independence and at the same time to leave them to be torn to pieces by U.S. imperialism. However, these calculations are not destined to come into being. The Soviet Union -- and this has been continually stated by its leaders -- will always be on the side of these who are striving to throw off the yoke of colonial and neocolonial slavery.

IZVESTIYA ON TAIWAN ISSUE IN U.S.-PRC RELATIONS

PM291703 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Oct 81 Morning Edition p 5

[S. Agafonov article: "Beijing-Washington: The Taiwan Factor"]

[Text] Recently the Western and especially the American press and diplomatic circles have been actively discussing the Taiwan problem in the light of a number of remarks by the current PRC leaders and the propaganda campaign that the Chinese mass media have mounted over the question of uniting the island with the mainland.

It has to be said that this is not the first time China's leadership has put forward proposals on this score. Initiatives had previously been put forward on establishing mutual contacts in the spheres of trade, transport and cultural relations. China unilaterally lifted the duties on Taiwanese goods, mostly imported into the country via Hong Kong. Beijing's new proposals, the so-called 10-point program, envisage retaining extensive Taiwanese autonomy -- the inviolability of the socioeconomic system, local self-government, Taiwan's own armed forces and a number of other items -- and also include a proposal for participation by Taiwanese leaders in the PRC's supreme organs of state power.

The question of relations with Taiwan is certainly an internal concern of China.

At the same time, it is striking that in this instance Beijing's proposals are not only addressed to Taipei but are also clearly intended for Washington. By extensively propagandizing these proposals and emphasizing their "constructive" and "peace-loving" thrust, the Beijing leadership would like to camouflage the inequality of its own relations with Washington over the Taiwan issue and to try to ward off reproaches that it is disregarding national interests to further the strategic partnership with the United States. As is well known, the very process of American-Chinese rapprochement was based on fundamental concessions by Beijing on the Taiwan problem. China essentially agreed to postpone a settlement of the Taiwan issue for the indefinite future. However, any mention of this, and also the facts of the cooperation -- especially military cooperation -- between Washington and Taipei elicit a sensitive reaction from Beijing inasmuch as they are appreciable blows to the political reputation of the Chinese leaders, who pose in their remarks as uncompromising champions of the unification of the motherland. There are more and more occasions for irritation in Beijing. Recall, for instance, the recent trip to Taiwan by a representative American congressional delegation headed by C. Zablocki, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The main topic of the talks was "Taiwan's defense needs." The congressmen called for the modernization of Taiwan's Armed Forces, and C. Zablocki himself expressed the confidence that "the current administration and Congress will provide all that is necessary to maintain Taiwan's military potential at the proper level." Here, the guest from across the ocean noted, "Congress will not be influenced by objections from China."

Thus once again Washington presented Beijing with a bitter pill.

Many observers regard the Taiwan problem as a serious obstacle in the development of American-Chinese relations. Against the background of Beijing's deepening foreign policy strategic partnership with Washington, in which China is displaying solidarity with the White House on practically all burning questions of international politics, be it the U.S. support for the reactionary junta in El Salvador or the production of the neutron bomb, the Taiwan problem does indeed outwardly strike a very sharply discordant note. However, the facts show that this discordant note is jealously protected and fueled by...Washington itself.

In the process the following factors are clearly being taken into account. Mindful of the "unpredictability" of Beijing's policy, as insurance against possible somersaults by the Chinese partners and also in view of the ultimate incompatibility of the U.S. and Chinese global schemes on both the regional and the world scales, Washington is using Taiwan as a means of pressuring Beijing, as a kind of permanent irritant.

An important role here is played by the strategic location of the island, which can be turned momentarily into a perfectly prepared modern military base. In effect Taiwan is a kind of criterion of the U.S. "trust" of China. Essentially it is a game with a stacked deck in which Washington can influence its partner but Beijing is deprived of the possibility of doing likewise.

Thus the American flirtation with Taiwan, which is essentially U.S. interference in PRC internal affairs, is totally natural and logical. After all, according to certain State Department staffers, the whole process of the "normalization" of relations between Washington and Beijing has essentially been based on the "two Chinas" concept. As is well known, one of the basic principles in the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries was the recognition of the PRC Government as the only government representing the interests of China's people accompanied by the rupture of official relations with Taiwan. At the same time, besides defining the new status of Taiwan, "Law No 2,479 on the new relationship with Taiwan," adopted in April 1979 by the U.S. Congress, envisaged maintaining the whole complex of ties at the former level and leaving U.S. politicoeconomic interests untouched.

A kind of commentary on the new law was provided by the 55-percent increase in the volume of bilateral trade and the military deliveries to Taiwan, whose value totaled $800 million in 1979 alone (the year diplomatic relations were established between the United States and the PRC).

It is an interesting fact that the "China boom" in Western business circles has not only failed to weaken the Taiwanese economy but, on the contrary, has attracted even closer attention to the island. While the Beijing plans for attracting foreign capital have mostly remained mere plans, Taiwan has seemed a more reliable and advantageous partner whose stability, as it were, was guaranteed by American capital.

According to the New York TIMES, in recent years more than 200 American companies have invested almost $2.5 billion in Taiwan's economy. At the present time 10 so-called "grand projects" costing $7 billion are being implemented on the island under contracts concluded between American firms and Taiwan. According to U.S. Department of Commerce figures, Taiwan remains the second most important U.S. trading partner in Asia (after Japan), whereas Beijing occupies a modest seventh place.

More than 50 American treaties and agreements with Taiwan still remain in force. The sole exception -- and essentially a sham exception at that, as events show -- relates to the mutual defense treaty. When it announced the annulment of this treaty Washington hastened to assume commitments to ensure the "defense" of the island, enshrining this in legal form in "Law No 2,479."

Under these commitments, the United States is continuing to pack Taipei with weapons. Thus Washington has adopted a 5-year (1979-83) program of arms deliveries to Taiwan. These deliveries include fighters, missiles, tanks, artillery, bombs, torpedoes and a number of other modern types of armaments. Moreover, there are plans for the holding of joint military maneuvers, visits by American warships to Taiwanese ports and the training of Taiwanese military personnel in the United States and at bases in third countries.

If you add to all this the activity of "unofficial" organizations such as the "American Taiwan Institute" and the Taiwanese "Coordinating Council on North American Affairs," which essentially perform the functions of embassies, with all the attendant diplomatic privileges for staffers, Washington's position in approaching the Taiwan problem emerges pretty clearly. On the one hand there is overt disregard of the Chinese people's national interests, the violation of the norms of international law and effective interference in a sovereign state's affairs. On the other hand, there is all-round support for the Taiwan regime and the expansion of economic, military and diplomatic contacts with Taipei.

The White House certainly feels no doubts about China's possible reaction. The vocal protests by official Beijing and the Chinese Foreign Ministry documents couched in a "tough" tone exert no substantial influence on Washington. The United States responds to Beijing's loud messages with vague "explanations" and sometimes remains altogether silent. Moreover, official representatives of the current American administration are not bashful about speaking openly of the White House's intention of continuing to pursue a "two Chinas" policy. Thus on the eve of his visit to Beijing U.S. Secretary of State A. Haig declared: "We recognize the strategic need to strengthen our relations with the PRC. We see in this nothing incompatible with our commitments to observe the provisions of the law on relations with Taiwan." Similar declarations have repeatedly been made both by R. Reagan himself, who is known for his pro-Taiwan sympathies, and by his closest advisers -- R. Allen, E. Meese and others. Even when it announced the lifting of restrictions on the sale of modern weapons to Beijing, Washington emphasized that the United States would continue to deliver weapons to Taiwan as well.

The American capital is perfectly well aware of the true worth of the show of indignation by Beijing, which is effectively using Taiwan as small change in its relations with the partner across the ocean. The facts show that it is certainly not national interests that are the Chinese leaders' first concern. Beijing's latest initiatives regarding Taiwan are essentially pragmatic and are aimed at smoothing over a serious irritant in bilateral relations with Washington.

PRAVDA NOTES 'DISCONTENT' IN PRC ARMY, YOUTH

PM3011135 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 81 p 5

[B. Barakhta article: "Beijing: Instability Persists"]

[Text] The internal political situation in China even after the recent 6th CCP Central Committee Plenum remains complex and unstable. Despite Beijing propaganda's strenuous assertions that "an excellent atmosphere of stability and cohesion" has been achieved in the country," reality attests otherwise.

The plenum's tendency to compromise on many questions, as was to be expected, was merely the prologue to another exacerbation of the power struggle and of the internal political contradictions in the country. In the opinion of foreign observers each of the rival factions is seeking, on the threshold of the 12th CCP Congress next year, to "push forward" their "own people" to commanding positions of authority and to neutralize the activity of their opponents. The internecine struggle is spreading like ripples in the water, embracing ever more echelons of the leadership.

To judge by the admission of the central Chinese press, despite the plenum decisions antagonism is continuing in the party and country between various opinions, including diametrically opposed ones, concerning the role of Mao Zedong and his "Thoughts" in the history of the CCP and the PRC. In contrast to recent assessments of the "Cultural Revolution" as "the greatest calamity" in the Chinese people's history, propaganda following the plenum decisions is again urging the party and people to "bear aloft" the banner of "The Thoughts of Mao Zedong" and is calling them "the most progressive ideology of our time." At the same time articles explaining the plenum documents sharply criticize those who, as the newspaper RENMIN RIBAO puts it, "are creating ideological chaos and have broken with the thoughts of Mao Zedong."

The "unity of views" achieved at the cost of certain concessions made by the most influential Deng Xiaoping grouping, in the opinion of the Japanese newspaper Tokyo SHIMBUN, has in no way reduced the pitch of antagonism in Beijing and local areas. As is well known, this grouping failed to achieve the definitive elimination from the Politburo of the CCP Central Committee and the state apparatus of Hua Guofeng and others who owe their careers to the "Cultural Revolution." The prevailing distribution of forces predetermined the persistent opposition to similar attempts at lower levels of party and administrative power where a numerous stratum of people who made their careers in 1966-76 is preserved.

According to RENMIN RIBAO "there has been no radical improvement" in the party and state and the phenomena of "ideological passivity" and "a factional struggle" and even of "resistance" to the plenum decisions are to be observed among CCP members and cadre workers. In a number of regions of the PRC, the journal HONGQI wrote, demonstrations by supporters of the deposed "gang of four" are taking place, leaflets and illegal publications criticizing the present leadership's course are being distributed, and "subversive" organizations are being created.

Symptomatic in this sense is the press' publication of the results of a survey of the state of affairs in the Behei Province party organization. Here about 50 percent of cells are "semiparalyzed," that is they are virtually idle, riven by factional struggle.

At the same time propaganda has begun to speak of the emergence of the so-called "rightwing deviation" toward "bourgeois liberalism," "bourgeois democracy" and "worship of the West." All this it may be understood from the Beijing press' half-admissions, is the direct result of the Chinese leadership's proimperialist course in the international arena and the so-called "open door" policy in the interests of implementing the hegemonistic "program of the four modernizations."

In an attempt to preserve compromise, to "reconcile" the supporters of the "Cultural Revolution" line with those who were subject to fierce repressions during this brutal campaign, propaganda is urging people not to seek out specific culprits, not to settle accounts, but "to forgive each other's offences" and launch "criticism and self-criticism." However, these slogans are failing to reach their target, and, as foreign observers note, the possibility is not ruled out that there will be an extensive new purge at all echelons of the party and state and army apparatus.

Grave dissatisfaction has affected the army, which is one of the regime's main bastions. In RENMIN RIBAO Wei Guoqing, chief of the Chinese army main political directorate, was obliged to admit that a negative attitude to the present leadership's policy is widespread among servicemen and that there are manifestations of "bourgeois liberalism" and "extreme individualism." Many military leaders, according to foreign press reports, blame these processes on the campaign "to emancipate consciousness" and on the ideological precepts of recent years. At the same time the so-called "young commanders" who made their careers on the crest of the "Cultural Revolution" are now opposing the attempts of Deng Xiaoping, who has taken the post of chairman of the CCP Central Committee Military Council, to place the Chinese People's Liberation Army under his control and complete the purge of all dissidents that has been initiated in it.

Discontent and negative feelings toward the authorities are spreading among young people and the intelligentsia. Thus, addressing a recent session of the National People's Congress Standing Committee, Education Minister Jiang Nanxiang noted that feelings of political indifference and lack of understanding of the "policy of the four modernizations" are to be observed among young men and women and many lack a sense of concern for the country's future while several have "gone so far" as to repudiate the CCP's course and policy. As for the intelligentsia, it is displaying increasing distrust in the Beijing leadership's pragmatic zigzags in the sphere of culture and ideology.

It is indicative that the press is continuing to criticize young cadre workers and party members. As is well known, approximately 20 million people were admitted to the CCP during and after the "Cultural Revolution" and the negative attitude among them to the present leadership's course is causing the Beijing ruling clique grave anxiety.

The general instability of the situation in China is aggravated by failures in pursuing economic and social policy and the Beijing leadership's inability to resolve the PRC's topical problems.

BEIJING GAINING ACCESS TO U.S., NATO ARSENALS

LD280948 Moscow TASS in English 0837 GMT 28 Oct 81

[Text] Moscow, 28 Oct, TASS -- A new step was made recently toward establishing military cooperation between the United States and the People's Republic of China, Boris Barakhta says in PRAVDA today. He writes that the Washington administration has drawn up a rather long list of arms and military equipment which the Reagan government is ready to supply to China. Meeting Beijing's wishes, it included in this "catalogue" anti-tank arms, radar systems, missiles, computerized control systems, laser facilities, etc. Moreover, it ordered that the procedure for issuing export licences to China should be simplified to the utmost and that over 400 Chinese requests for the supply of military equipment and technology given prompt consideration.

According to foreign news agencies, China and Britain are going to sign, before the end of this year, a 600-million-sterling agreement on the modernization of the Chinese Navy, the commentary says. Companies of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Japan and some other countries are willing to "help" with the arms race. All this gives the Beijing hegemonists access to the modern arsenals of the USA and NATO.

MESSAGE TO SUPREME SOVIET, COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

LD271704 Moscow TASS in English 1647 GMT 27 Oct 81

[Text] Moscow, 27 Oct, TASS -- A message of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress and the State Council of the PRC addressed to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the USSR was received here. The message expresses gratitude for congratulations upon the 32nd anniversary of the formation of the People's Republic of China and expresses the wish for the development of friendship between the peoples of the two countries.

POLISH SEJM MEETS, DISCUSSES ECONOMIC CRISIS

Session Opens

LD301924 Moscow TASS in English 1845 GMT 30 Oct 81

[Text] Warsaw, 30 Oct, TASS -- A regular meeting of the Sejm of the Polish People's Republic opened here today.

The deputies were addressed by Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, chairman of the Council of Ministers, who stressed that the socio-political situation in the country had aggravated still further. He said that a government bill on effective measures in the interests of the state had been submitted to the Presidium of the Sejm. The Council of Elders had drawn up a draft decision of the Sejm calling for an end to strikes. If this decision is not observed, the government will urgently ask the Sejm to put into operation the measures provided for by this law. The interests of the state and tranquility in the country should and would be protected, Wojciech Jaruzelski stressed.

In conclusion he made proposals on a number of new appointments in the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic.

Olenichev Reports Results

LD011038 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 1 Nov 81

[Correspondent Viktor Olenichev report on Polish Sejm session in Warsaw]

[Text] The Polish Sejm met at a time of sharp aggravation of the situation in the country. In some places work stoppages are underway organized by the extremist leadership in Solidarity. Those people are making blatant attacks on the policy by the Polish United Workers' Party and the government. This situation was the main subject on the agenda of the session by the highest body of state power. Addressing the deputies, First Secretary of the Polish United Workers' Party and Prime Minister Wojciech Jaruzelski called the present situation critical. Adventurists masterminding the policy of Solidarity, he said, are seeking to explode from within the state structures and paralyze any constructive steps by the government. The damage caused by strikes and continued tensions is on the rise all along. This damage is a burden shouldered by all of society and it is worsening living conditions. Billions of zloty and a large amount of essential commodities have been lost beyond retrieve. There have been even cases of encroachment on the defense industry and Poland's allied commitments. General Jaruzelski went on by saying that anti-Soviet excesses, setting as it were our home on fire, are also part and parcel of the anti-popular activities of extremists. This cannot go on any longer. The Polish leader warned the extremist elements: He who sows the wind shall reap the storm.

The deputies, representatives of the Polish United Workers' Party, of the United Peasant and Democratic Parties, pressed demands for an end to the destructive activities of the Solidarity leadership which is aggravating the economic degradation, inflicting immense damage on Poland's national interests and undermining its international prestige. In its resolution the Sejm urges a stop to economically ruinous work stoppages and obligates the government to proceed determinedly against anarchy and violations of legality. The decision says in part that the highest body of state power reserves the right if necessary to take other steps in this direction as well, specifically to give the government such powers as will be required by the situation. The decision by the Polish parliament is fully in line with the mood of the broadest segments of the Polish public. Shortly before the session there had been public opinion surveys and the most polled come out for an end to strikes.

The Sejm also reviewed the economic situation. The deputies voiced profound concern over the continued decline in production and difficulties with the payments and trade balance. The budget deficit this year will amount to Z200 billion. The deputies spoke highly of the Soviet Union's position who, understanding Poland's difficulties, is giving tangible economic assistance. At the same time, as it was stressed all during the debates, the nation cannot go on living on credit all the time. It is effective and well disciplined work that can pull the country out of a crisis. The Sejm has upheld the government's efforts to secure a boost in coal extraction, to advance farming, solve the food problem and increase exports. These are the key areas for this and next year, it was pointed out.

Jaruzelski Address Cited

LD311614 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1420 GMT 31 Oct 81

[TASS correspondent's report from Warsaw]

[Text] Warsaw, 31 Oct (TASS) -- Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Council of Ministers of Poland, delivered a speech at a Sejm session of the Polish People's Republic.

He said that the sociopolitical situation in the country is continuing to get worse. The wave of tension, conflicts and strikes is not receding. Economic difficulties are becoming worse. The question arises why, despite government measures, is the economic situation not improving but on the contrary, becoming worse? The basic reason for the continuation of the tension in the sociopolitical situation is that the economy has become the arena for a struggle with the organs of power. The damage caused by strikers, tension, and a lowering in labor discipline is constantly growing, and the cost of the strikes is being shouldered by the whole of society and reflected in worsening living standards.

In presenting the program for overcoming the crisis to the Sejm, the government stressed that in order ot implement it, calm and opportunity for normal work by the people, as well as the active cooperation of all public forces was necessary. Today, it is deemed incumbent to state that these conditions are not being fulfilled. This is the main reason for the fact that results are not commensurate with the measures being undertaken.

The main direction for action, W. Jaruzelski continued, must be a growth in production and an increase in the supply of goods. However, we are not capable of obtaining in a short time a sufficient enough increase to reestablish equilibrium in the market. Therefore there can be no doubt among each of us who is realistically and without prejudice searching for ways to improve the current situation that without many other measures, particularly without a comprehensive reform of retail prices and a stop to the excess growth in incomes, we will not solve these problems.

He further called for an intensification in the fight against speculation and fraud.

Speaking of improvements in labor conditions and living standards of miners, W. Jaruzelski expressed the hope that the measures being implemented in the mining industry will aid a growth in coal output.

Jaruzelski stressed that for industry to operate normally, stable supplies of fuel and raw materials are essential. The only way to reduce the rate of imports, the speaker pointed out, is to increase exports. There is no other way to rid oneself of debts to the West and to balance trade exchange with the CEMA countries. To live on further credits is impossible. This is being said by our partners in the East and West alike.

Therefore, irrespective of temporary measures, the government, within the framework of economic reforms has prepared a number of decisions which will increase an interest in the output of export production.

Being in favor of the speediest implementation of the deepest reforms, Jaruzelski continued, we have to weigh the situation in accordance with reality and to strictly comply with objective economic laws. We cannot create the illusion that from 1 January 1982 there will occur a sudden transformation in the economic conditions in the country, and that the reform mechanisms will start to operate immediately. Over a lengthy period of time, one will have to struggle with great difficulties, the absence of basic raw materials, energy and fuel and a shortage of many goods.

Analyzing the reasons for the situation which has arisen, Wojciech Jaruzelski said, in particular, our country is passing through a critical moment. The national economy is being degraded, the state structure is being subverted from within, social links between the towns and rural areas, which took years to establish, are being shaken loose. Lawlessness, law-breaking and strike madness are becoming a way of life. Constant tension, endless demands and the incitement of hatred for the organs of power, socialism, and our natural allies, all this is crippling not only the material but also the psychological and moral fiber of the people. We cannot go on living like this.

Appeals to defend our highest national interests fail to bring results. We have not only monetary inflation, but also inflation in the use of words. How much longer can we continue to deal in appeals and slogans, rebukes and warnings? How many more times can one declare one's readiness for accord, dialogue, constructive cooperation? As a rule, all this shatters itself against a wall of ill-will, bitterness and antigovernment hysteria.

The extremist forces of Solidarity are practically creating a counterbalance to authority. They are foisting their will on it, are abusing the trust of the masses and trade union members who are unaware of the terrible game into which they are being drawn by this group of adventurists who formulate the trade union's and its many local organizations' policy. Solidarity is operating in Poland without hindrance. The struggle with their own state, the subversion of its cohesion, the paralyzing of its economy, is not in accordance with one's understanding of a trade union. This is hostile activity. The state, for the people, is the highest of treasures. In accordance with the spirit and the letter of the existing law, the organs of power cannot accept the dissemination of antistate publications which whip up social tension, which call for the overthrow of the social system and government, and which are also directed against our alliance -- on the stability of which depends our sovereign existence as a state and the durability of our borders.

The anti-Soviet excesses, the wicked anti-Soviet propaganda are fanning the flames under our own house, declared Jaruzelski. It is, objectively speaking, an antinational activity. In the name of the elementary interests of the people, one cannot tolerate it with patience. Strikes, strike readiness and protests in many regions of the country are continuing. Billions of zlotys have been irretrievably lost, as well as a large quantity of essential goods. Foreign trade contracts are being dealt considerable damage. We have once gain lost currency essential for the purchase of medicines, foodstuffs and equipment. There was evan an attack against the defense industry, which ensures the security of the state and the obligations of Poland as an ally. Those who sow the wind shall also reap the storm.

Touching upon the recently-held strikes, Jaruzelski stressed that each hour of a strike in the mines means unheated nurseries and kindergartens; each hour of a strike in industry means fresh suffering for those who have worked honestly for Poland throughout their lives. Let the organizers of strikes themselves be answerable to the people, particularly to mothers of small children, war and labor veterans and gray-haired citizens. What gives them the right to weaken the economy and whip up tension on the eve of the coming winter?

The strike atmosphere is being spread throughout Poland in accordance with all the rules of a psychological war. However, voices raised in protest against the activities of dictator-like elements among Solidarity are now being heard more often. Already they are not willingly giving in to the strike psychosis. The supporters of confrontation in Solidarity often resort to threats. Manifestations of psychological pressure and terror in respect of those who have the courage to think otherwise are also being noted.

Voices are heard, calling for reprisals against party members, communists. Let the government's answer be clear and precise, Jaruzelski noted. We warn those who threaten.

In connection with the prevalent dangerous situation, I have given the Sejm's Presidium the government draft law on emergency measures to defend the interests of citizens and the state, Jaruzelski declared. Meanwhile the Council of Elders has today presented the Sejm with a draft resolution which resolutely poses the question of an immediate rejection of the strike campaign, as well as the cessation of all activities which violate social order. Should this Sejm resolution not be adhered to, than I will urgently approach the Sejm with a request to pass the said draft law. The interests of the socialist state and calm within the country must be and will be defended.

The Ninth PZPR Congress program resolution expressed itself in favor of working out a new model of a National Unity Front. I propose to appoint a council of national accord, which in the near future will begin to examine and agree on a program for the front, its role, structure and principles of action in sociopolitical life. I invite the Democratic Party, the United Peasant Party, trade unions, and public, scientific and creative organizations to take part in this council.

We can save and lead our country from this crisis only by joint effort and through common responsible action by all those who stand by the fundamental constitution of the Polish People's Republic, and to whom the cause of tranquillity, security and the secure future of the Polish people is dear.

He noted that the measures being undertaken must be implemented, but that the leading role of the PZPR must, at the same time, be preserved.

In conclusion Wojciech Jaruzelski proposed that a number of new appointments to the government be made.

WASHINGTON POST 'STANCE' ON POLAND CRITICIZED

LD302138 Moscow in Polish to Poland 1700 GMT 30 Oct 81

["At a Sharp Angle" program; unattributed commentary]

[Text] It is no secret that the West spares no efforts to disrupt the socialist foundations of Poland and to aggravate the crisis in the country. NATO is using the situation in the Polish People's Republic as the reason for sabre-rattling and whipping up the war psychosis. The special services of that military bloc assign enormous sums to anti-Polish centers, financing and supporting in the ideological sense the counterrevolution in Poland. The "Silex-5" plan, worked out in NATO, is put into practice with the aim of running the Polish People's Republic in the financial sense with foreign currency.

Western politicians, above all in the United States, have undertaken a multitude of various actions concerning Poland aimed at increasing tension in Polish People's Republic and to show their support for the Polish counterrevolution. For instance, the U.S. President in his interview for the Washington POST allowed himself unceremoniously to lay down for the Polish Government which measures it can, and which it should not, take. But despite this, the Washington POST believes the West does not sufficiently interfere in Poland's internal affairs. In recent days, the daily published a series of articles on this subject.

The Washington POST authors accuse the leaders of the Western world of a primitive militaristic approach to the problems of foreign policy, wishing to achieve strategic superiority exclusively through increased armaments. The daily considers that the shortest and simplest way to changing the existing balance of power in the world in favor of the West leads through wrenching Poland from the socialist community. Thus, the Washington POST authors recommend various means which, in their opinion, should influence the development of Polish events in a direction favorable to the West.

William Hyland, senior scientific worker of the so-called [word indistinct] foundation for universal peace, for instance, is of the opinion that the most efficient is the financial-economic factor. The main task for the West -- according to his article -- is the defense of, and support for Polish counterrevolution which has infiltrated Solidarity, and helping it to seize power. He explains to the short-sighted politicians: If Solidarity is saved, this will lead to the most radical changes in Europe since World War II. This proves that the fifth column active in Poland merits greater investments than has been the case so far. (?He) even quotes an approximate sum the West should earmark for the creeping counterrevolution: $12 billion. Quite a lot, is it not? However, the specialist in actions for universal peace advises no stinginess with money. A peaceful overturn [przewrot] in Poland, he wrote, was worth 50 B-1 bombers, since it cannot but change thoroughly the balance of forces in Europe.

Washington POST observer Joseph Kraft suggests a cheaper way of exerting pressure on Polish People's Republic: the political one. Actually he does not even (?suggest), but demands that the West should counteract more actively all the attempts by Poles to put their homeland's affairs in order. From such positions Kraft comments, for example, on the fact that inside the PZPR, as he writes, the group realizing the need to subject Solidarity to a certain discipline is growing in numbers. The American journalist does not like it at all. Therefore he insists that, theoretically the Western bloc should react to this more energetically. Western leaders, Kraft says in an accusatory tone, neglect the possibility for resolute comments, among other things on the subject of the latest decisions of plenary sessions of the PZPR Central Committee.

As can be seen from all this, the Washington POST has taken a very aggressive stance on the Polish question. (?Thus), the daily tries to help the imperialist circles in working ouf a more flexible and effective anti-Polish strategy.

TRYBUNA LUDU CHIEF EDITOR VISITS PRAVDA

PM281523 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Oct 81 p 5

["Information" report: "Meeting Held"]

[Text] W. Bek, chief editor of the newspaper TRYBUND LUDU, organ of the PZPR Central Committee, who has come for the Ninth Congress of the International Organization of Journalists, has visited PRAVDA, where he met with the chief editor and members of the editorial board.

SFRY DELEGATION MEETS SOLOMENTSEV, DEPARTS USSR

LD010234 Moscow in Slovene to Yugoslavia 1930 GMT 31 Oct 81

[Text] In Moscow today Mikhail Solomentsev, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and Mikhial Yasnov, chairman of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, met with the delegation of the Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Serbia led by Assembly President Dusan Ckrebic. The meeting was held in a warm and friendly atmosphere. Marko Olandic, Yugoslav ambassador to the USSR, attended the meeting. The Serbian Assembly delegation, which was in the USSR at the invitation of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, let for home today.

MOSCOW LEADERS GREET BELGRADE ON ANNIVERSARY

PM300935 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 20 Oct 81 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Congratulatory Telegram"]

[Text] In connection with the 37th anniversary of Belgrade's liberation from the fascist invaders V.V. Grishin, first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom, and V.F. Promyslov, chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom, have sent a greetings telegram to Comrade Dusan Gligorijevic, president of the Belgrade LCY City Conference, and Comrade Zivorad Kovacevic, president of the Belgrade City Assembly, saying:

On behalf of the Moscow Gorkom, Moscow Gorispolkom and all Muscovites, we cordially congratulate you, the communists and all the inhabitants of the Yugoslav capital, on the 37th anniversary of Belgrade's liberation from the fascist invaders.

The years of our peoples' heroic joint struggle against the common enemy, Hitlerite fascism, will never be erased from the memories of Muscovites or all Soviet people.

On this noteworthy day we express the confidence that the multificeted Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation and our hero-cities' friendly ties will continue to develop and deepen for the good of the USSR and SFRY peoples, and of the cause of socialism and peace.

We wish you and, through you, all Belgrade's working people great successes in socialist building.

USTINOV GREETINGS MESSAGE TO ROMANIAN ARMY

PM291605 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Oct 81 p 1

[Text] To Comrade Lt Gen K. Olteanu, Romanian minister of national defense

Esteemed Comrade Minister:

On be behalf of the USSR Armed Forces and on my own behalf I send you and all Romanian servicemen sincere congratulations on the 37th anniversary of the creation of the Romanian Army.

I express the confidence that Soviet-Romanian combat cooperation will continue to strengthen and develop for the good of our peoples and armies.

I wish the servicemen of the Romanian Army the further improvement of their combat skill in the interests of strengthening the defense capability of their motherland and of all the countries of the socialist community.

With communist greetings,

[Signed] Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Ustinov, USSR defense minister

LEONID BREZHNEV ANSWERS DER SPIEGEL QUESTIONS

LD020600 Moscow TASS in English 0530 GMT 2 Nov 81

["Leonid Brezhnev's interview to DER SPIEGEL magazine" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 2 Nov, TASS -- Follow Leonid Brezhnev's answers to questions of the West German magazine DER SPIEGEL:

Question: "You will be going on a state visit to the FRG for the third time. Since your latest visit in 1978 the situation in the world has become less stable and more dangerous in some respects. What role, in your opinion, could the Federal Republic of Germany play in the present situation, and what significance do you attach to your forthcoming talks in Bonn?"

Answer: "To begin with, I am glad to visit your country again. I have been in the FRG twice. In both cases we had useful talks and meetings. I recall them with gratification.

"My forthcoming visit to the FRG at the invitation of Chancellor Schmidt is a natural follow-up to the line of mutually beneficial cooperation between our countries, constructive development of Soviet-West German relations on the basis of the treaty of 1970. This course of ours has been most definitely expressed at the 24th, 25th and 26th Congresses of the CPSU. We know that in Bonn, too, the relations between the FRG and the Soviet Union are viewed as an important element of world politics, on which stable peace in Europe depends in no small measure.

"There of course, will be no lack of subjects in the exchange of views with Chancellor Helmut Schmidt and other FRG leaders. As far as I can see, it is particularly important nowadays to determine what actions could each of our countries take for the resolution of the task that is most vital and urgent to mankind -- that of preventing a nuclear catastrophe and creating a reliable prospect of durable peace.

"Both our countries have repeatedly declared for establishing a military balance in Europe at the lowest possible level, including in the field of nuclear arms. The question is how this should be done. Here our views noticeably diverge. But we must search for a solution. I recall that in the joint declaration, which was signed by Chancellor Schmidt and myself in May 1978, both sides explicitly declared that nobody should seek military superiority and said that rough equality and parity are sufficient for ensuring defence. We adhere to it now, too. This is, for that matter, the starting point for the subsequent talks.

"You are asking about the FRG's role in our truly complicated world. I believe that at the start of the eighties, like it was at the start of the seventies, the FRG is faced with decisions of fundamental order. Will the course, which so much increased the FRG's weight in the European and world politics, be continued and further developed, or the capital accumulated over these years will be squandered in fruitless and dangerous confrontations? I would wish to hope that as a result of our talks and conversations with Chancellor Schmidt, other statesmen and politicians of the FRG, there will be an increase in the reciprocal confidence that our countries will carry on the tested line, which lived up to expectations: the ability to reciprocate with confidence to confidence, to safeguard what has been achieved, to develop consistently and tirelessly bilateral cooperation in various fields. Such a line would attune well to common efforts for containing the arms race, strengthening detente and international security."

Ouestion: "Particularly great hopes were once pinned on joint economic projects. What are, in your view, the prospects for the economic cooperation between our two countries under the present-day conditions?"

Answer: "In our view, economic cooperation between the USSR and the FRG is developing quite well and has a good future.

"Today the FRG is one of the Soviet Union's leaing trade partners among the Western countries. The efficiency and concientiousness with which our Western German partners meet their commitments under economic treaties and agreements are valued in the USSR. We, of course, answer in kind.

"As far as I understand, the development of large-scale and long-term economic ties with the USSR helps the FRG resolve the serious problems facing its economy. Your country, no less than other countries, needs reliable sources of energy, raw and primary materials, foreign orders to ensure the employment of the population. The Soviet Union also benefits by cooperation with the FRG in a number of important fields of our economic life.

"It is also highly essential that our economic ties meet not only the requirements of today, but are built with a broad prospect. A good example of this cooperation are, in my view, some of our joint projects which are projected into the 21st century. They, certainly, are not only of economic, but of political significance -- in the best sense of this word. As orientation at a long-term prospect in economic relations is also orientation at durable peaceful coexistence, at goodnieghbourliness."

"The recent scheduled session in Moscow of the mixed Soviet-West German Commission for Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation, the talks in this connection of Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Tikhonov and Vice-Chairman Leonid Kostandov with Federal Economics Minister Otto Lambsdorff and other FRG representatives were held precisely from this point of view, with an eye to the future.

"Judging by the results of that session, there is a solid basis for a futher development of our relations. We felt the seriousness of the FRG's approach to the planned deal on fresh supplies of Soviet gas in exchange for the supplies of pipes and construction in the Soviet Union with West German participation of a gas pipeline between Europe and Siberia. Other opportunities of mutually beneficial cooperation have been also identified.

"I would wish to add one thing more in connection with our economic cooperation: it is not detrimental to anybody and, in the final analysis, is beneficial to all as it strengthens the fundamentals of peace in Europe and all over the world.

Question: "East-West relations have seriously complicated nowadays. How do you evaluate the situation in the world and, the destiny of detente, which seemed almost irreverisble to many politicians?"

Answer: "There is no quiet in the world today. 'Hot spots' are emerging in different parts of the world. The race of death-carrying weapons is continuing. New types of them are created, which are particularly dangerous because they, as experts say, lower the threshold of nuclear war, i.e. make its outbreak more probable. Under these conditions the speculation of some strategists and politicians in the West on the admissibility of some 'limited' nuclear war and the possibility to win a victory in it looks particularly insidious.

"Maybe somebody really hopes that it will be possible to confine nuclear war to the territory of Europe, and considers it to be an acceptable variant for himself. Needless to say that such a variant very little suits the Europeans. To them it would be death, a catastrophe, that would lead to the destruction of entire nations and their many centuries' old civilisation.

"As a matter of fact, there can be in general no 'limited' nuclear war. If a nuclear war breaks out, whether it be in Europe or in any other place, it would inevitably and unavoidably assume a world-wide character. Such is the logic of the war itself and the character of present-day armaments and international relations. One should clearly see and understand it.

"So, those who possibly hope to set fire to the nuclear powder keg, while themselves sitting snug aside, should not entertain any illusions.

"Recently your magazine published an interview with a scientist who is described as the 'father' of the American neutron bomb. He let fall a phrase: all people are monsters. His daughter, who was present then, asked: then are you a monster too? Yes I am, he answered, and added that war is in man's very nature. Here is a striking specimen of human-hating psychology of those who are today zealously whipping up the nuclear arms race.

"In so doing, they are apparently bidding hope on lulling the vigilance of the Europeans, on getting them accustomed to assessing the same neutron weapon as a usual thing, a 'defence' means, in a word, something like a bayonet or a grenade. Meanwhile, things stand quite differently. Since, as experts say, several neutron charges will be enough to destroy every living thing in such a city, say, as Hamburg.

"All this is unpleasant talk, but the truth concerning all should be pronounced loudly and straightforwardly. It should be said, before it is too late, while it is possible yet to prevent the calamity. It is no problem to create the neutron weapon. The real problem is a political and humanitarian one -- how to prevent the emergence and use of such a weapon. Once the Europeans have succeeded in doing so, they can cope with it nowadays too.

"It is claimed in some capitals of the NATO countries that the Soviet Union is allegedly responsible for the clouds gathering over the world. But if one rejects the propagandist chimeras and turns to facts, it will become clear that this is a malicious invention.

"The Soviet Union does not threaten anybody, is not planning to attack anyone. Our military doctrine is of a defensive character. It rules out preventive wars and the 'first strike' concept. I can also say with all responsibility that the Soviet Union will under no circumstances use the nuclear weapon against the states, which have renounced its production and acquisition and do not have it on their territory. We are ready to give contractual guarantees of it to any country without a single exception.

"Our striving to prevent a nuclear holocaust has been convincingly expressed at the current session of the UN General Assembly where the USSR has put forward a new important and constructive initiative. The main thing about it is to ensure that nobody should ever be the first to use the nuclear weapon. And if nobody is the first to use it, this, consequently, means that it will not be used at all.

"As it came to the Soviet Union's stand on the issues of war and peace, let me remind you something else. [sentence as received]

"We, as is known, have signed with the United States and were ready to implement honestly the second treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms, SALT-II.

"We propose to reach agreement on ending not only all and every nuclear weapons tests, but also their further production in order to limit and then to liquidate their stocks in general.

"We propose that the development and creation of any new types of mass destruction weapons be prohibited contractually.

"We have put forward proposals on specific, weighed and fair measures for lessening tensions and eliminating seats of conflicts on vast expanses from central Europe to the Far East, including the Middle East, the Persian Gulf and Indian ocean zone.

"Unfortunately, the leading powers of the West, above all, the NATO bloc, do not show so far a serious interest in talks on all of these questions that are vital to mankind and its peaceful future. Some people there are by far more willing speak not on detente, but on confrontation; not on peaceful mutually beneficial cooperation, but on the use of trade to military-strategic ends; not on agreements on the basis of equality and equal security, but on diktat from the positions of military supremacy; not on the elimination by joint efforts of seats of conflicts, but on the creation of ever new military bases, on the build-up of their military presence in various parts of the world; not on curbing the arms race, but on 'rearmament'; not on a limitation or prohibition of some or other types of weapons, but on the creation of ever new, even more destructive means of mass annihilation of people.

"This way, unfortunately, they not only speak, but also act in practice. You, certainly, understand that I have in mind, above all, the policy of the present U.S. administration, the way it was manifest both in statements by high-ranking statesmen of that country and, which is even more important, in their practical deeds.

"All of it is actually an opposite to detente, blunt disregard for the striving of all peoples for lasting peace. And it is, certainly, profoundly deplorable that the leaders of one of the world's biggest powers have deemed it possible to build their policy on such a basis.

"As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, as I have repeatedly had occasion to say, we sincerely strive for normal relations with the USA based on mutal respect and consideration for each other's rights and interests. Moreover, we would like to have good, friendly relations with the USA in the name of strengthening peace on earth.

"Soviet-American talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe lie ahead, I will later speak about it. And some time following which, as we hope, SALT talks will start. We will conduct both talks fairly and constructively, striving for a fair agreement with due regard, of course, for the security interests of the Soviet people, its friends and allies.

"President Reagan has recently expressed the readiness of the USA to discuss with the Soviet Union also other problems, which cause differences between the two countries. We welcome such readiness, as we have always considered talks to be the most appropriate method of resolving international problems. The main thing, of course, is that appropriate practical deeds should be matched to correct words.

"And it would be better to abandon dreams of ensuring military supremacy over the USSR. If necessary, the Soviet people will find opportunities for making any additional efforts, for doing everything necessary to ensure their country's reliable defence. It is by far more sensible and realistic to speak of preserving the parity, which already exists, and, as experience has shown, is quite a good basis for preserving peace.

"Europe is, of course, called upon to play a special role in strengthening peace and deepening detente, at least because it is the most crowded and fragile of all of mankind's 'homes,' which would inevitably be a victim of nuclear conflagration. The final act of the Helsinki conference is evidence of the fact that the European states realize the value of peace and danger of military threat. Is it not also seen from the spontaneous anti-war and anti-missile movement, which is unfolding nowadays in a number of NATO countries as an answer to the dangerous militaristic policy of that bloc's leaders?

"But the point is not only the wave of popular protest against adventurism. The Europeans make an inestimable contribution to strengthening peace by their day-to-day creative activity, by permanently broadening and strengthening fruitful peaceful ties between the peoples of the continent -- the economic, scientific-technical and cultural ties, contacts between parliaments, public organizations and municipal bodies, etc. As in spite of the chilling minds and destructive calls, which come from the camp of the enemies of detente, the material structure of peaceful cooperation in Europe continues strengthening and enriching. One cannot but recall once again the words which Lenin said almost 60 years ago in connection with the relations between young Soviet Russia and the bourgeois states:

"...We may argue, we may quarrel, we may disagree on specific combinations -- it is highly probable that we shall have to disagree -- this fundamental economic necessity will, nevertheless, after all is said and done, make a way for itself...regular trade relations between the Soviet Republic and all the capitalist countries in the world are certain to continue developing." (Lenin, Collected Works, English edition, vol 33, page 265) Life has borne out and continues bearing out the wisdom of this prounouncement."

As far as the role of the Federal Republic is concerned in the creation of this fabric of peaceful ties in Europe and the significance in this respect of relations between our two countries, I have already spoken about it.

Question: A new stage in the arms race is imminent. The problem of medium-range nuclear weapons, both of Soviet and American ones, has become one of the most acute for Europe. Do you see an opportunity to halt such a development?

Answer: I have more than once had occasion of say: We feel that there is no such field of disarmament and no such type of weapon on which agreement could not be reached. The problem of medium-range nuclear means in Europe can also be resolved in the interests of all European nations. Can and must be. But it will be possible to do so only provided all sides treat the construction of lasting peace as a common task.

What does it mean in specific terms? Your magazine is called (in translation) MIRROR. And may this mirror reflect the real picture.

Let us recall first how the events, which in the long run brought about the present situation with nuclear weapons in Europe, were unfolding. Since the fifties the USA deployed in Europe and the seas washing it nuclear weapons for delivering strikes against vital centers of the USSR and its allies. These weapons began to be called "forward-based means," and the doctrine of "brinkmanship." Then, or a little later, nuclear weapons appeared in Western Europe also in some other NATO member-countries.

Imagine yourself in our position. Could we indifferently regard how they were besieging us on all sides with military bases, how increasing numbers of carriers of nuclear death, irrespective in what form -- missiles from the sea or land, air bombs, etc. were targeted from various areas of Europe on Soviet cities and mills? The Soviet Union had to create means for its own defence, and not for threatening anyone, Europe least of all. It created and deployed them on its territory in numbers balancing the respective arms of those who declared themselves to be our potential enemies.

Neither then nor now have we considered nuclear confrontation, especially in Europe, to be the best solution. Many times the USSR proposed that at least a limit be put to rivalries in that field, but it has never come to real talks. Why? Neither in the sixties, nor in the seventies, the U.S. administrations wished that their medium-range systems, i.e., the so-called forward-based means, should also be a subject of talks and possible agreements should apply to them. In all evidence, the balance of medium-range nuclear forces which took shape suited the Americans then.

The subject of "Soviet menace" to Western Europe has been whipped up in Western propaganda in recent years, and reports began often to be published on "SS-20" missiles. We proposed in the autumn of 1979 that representatives of the USA and the USSR should meet without delay to examine the situation and reach agreement on a parity even at a lower level than has taken shape by that time. An answer to the Soviet initiative was NATO's "twin-track" decision of December 1979 on "rearmament."

But let us see what is after all the balance of nuclear forces in Europe.

If among the medium-range means are included the main missile and aviation nuclear weapons of the NATO countries, which are capable of reaching targets on the Soviet Union's territory from the territory of the West European countries and the water basins washing Europe, with a range (radious) of action of 1,000 kilometers and more (but less, of course, than intercontinental range) and the respective Soviet arms of similar range stationed in the European part of the USSR, there is presently a rough balance as regards such weapons between NATO and the USSR in Europe. The NATO countries have here 986 of such carriers. Among them the USA has more than 700 (F-111, FB-111, F-4 aircraft, planes on board aircraft carriers on the seas and oceans washing Europe). On top of it, the British potential includes 64 ballistic missiles and 55 bombers. France has 144 units (98 missiles and 46 bombers).

The Soviet Union has 975 units of similar weapons. The situation has not become different even after the USSR began replacing the "SS-4" and "SS-5" missiles, whose service life has expired, with the more advanced "SS-20." When deploying one new missile, we replace one or two old missiles and scrap the latter together with the launcher.

It is true that "SS-20" can carry three warheads. But their summary yield is less than that of one old warhead. Consequently, in the process of replacement of obsolete missiles, the total number of our carriers was decreasing, and simultaneously was reducing the aggregate yield of our medium-range nuclear potential.

But the NATO medium-range means are permanently perfected and increased. In Britian, for example, modernized ballistic missiles with six warheads (instead of three now) are installed in Polaris submarines. In France it is planned to replace ground- and sea-based missiles with a monoblock warhead with missiles with seven warheads. The number of French missile-carrying submarines also increases.

And this is at a time when as regards the number of nuclear charges fired against a target in one salvo, which is a highly essential indicator, NATO already now has a fifty percent advantage.

The above-cited data are a reflection of reality and clearly show how far-fetched is the clamour raised by NATO about the "intolerable superiroity" of the USSR as regards the medium-range weapons and the "necessity of rearmament." To be frank, it is sooner the Soviet Union which should have raised the question of rearmament.

If another almost 600 new American missiles are additonally deployed in Western Europe, NATO will receive a fifty percent advantage as regards carriers, and almost a one hundred percent advantage as regards nuclear charges.

Is not it clear that it would seriously upset the existing, considering all factors, rough balance, create a serious threat to the security of the USSR and its allies?

Remember how the United States reacted to a possibility of the deployment two decades ago of several tens of Soviet missiles in Cuba at the request of the Cuban Government. Washington claoured that mortal threat overhanged the United States.

And it is sought to convince us that U.S. forward-based nuclear means situated along the perimeter of our western frontiers is a theme that is forbidden, that is not to be discussed. All our activity to neutralize the existing threat is proclaimed to be "beyond the limits required by the USSR's defence," while the intention to deploy at our doorstep hundreds of the latest U.S. missiles over and above the existing ones is presented as an "act of defence." What is this -- cynicism or the loss of an elementary sense of proportion?

An arrangement has now been achieved with the United States to resume the talks on medium-range nuclear means. They will start one of these days in Geneva. The USSR welcomes this arrangement, just as it is welcomed by governments and millions of people in other countries who wish that the threat of new war be lessened, that the tension be eased, that peace be durable.

But there is a thing one cannot avoid mentioning. As the talks are drawing nearer, claims are being made ever more often by the U.S. side (and at a rather high level, at that) for a "special approach" to the United States. Rather peculiar preliminary conditions are being formulated: U.S. forward-based means should not be mentioned, nuclear weapons of the United States' allies in NATO should not be included into any balance, the scope of the talks should be limited to Soviet medium-range missiles, which should be dismantled "in return" for U.S. missiles planned to be deployed in Europe.

It is difficult to understand on what logic this attitude is based. In any case, it has nothing to do either with objectiveness or with realism. Those in the United States who are advancing this sort of "proposals" apparently themselves do not expect in a second that the Soviet Union might agree to them. Not a single state that is concerned about the security of its people would agree to this in our place.

Most probably the authors of such "proposals" really have no wish for talks, the least so successful talks. What they want is to disrupt the talks as a sort of justification for the continuation of the planned arms race, for turning Western Europe, as planned, into a launching pad for new U.S. missiles trained on the USSR. They are designing in advance the deadlock of the talks so as to say: Look, the USSR has no regard for the West's opinion, so the United States can do nothing but deploy the missiles....

This should be borne in mind by all who are truly concerned about the present dangerous situation in Europe and the world, who work sincerely for fruitful talks and nuclear arms limitation in Europe.

Everything in the official explanations of the plans for the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe is false, from the beginning to the end. It is a falsehood that all this is "additional armament" in answer to the defiance of the Soviet Union, which, allegedly, refused to hold talks on medium-range weapons. It is a falsehood that the United States decided to deploy its new missiles in Western Europe only in reply to the request of its allies and being motivated, exclusively, by the concern about their "security."

I shall not dwell on how the Americans were practically extorting the "consent" of some West Europeans to come under the "protection" of new U.S. missiles. This is known. It is not difficult to understand the hesitations of those who are being made the hostages of the policy of others, extras around theatre weapons, as is the expression now fashionable in Washington.

Who will be pushing the button to launch missiles? To which of the "two and a half" wars in which Secretary Weinberger is playing will they be geared? Suffice it to ask these and several other similar questions, to take into account that strategic objects on USSR territory are targets of U.S. missiles, that new U.S. carriers can be used as first strike weapons to reveal the essence of what is taking place.

Western Europe is being conditioned to another aggressive turn in the United States' nuclear doctrines at the cost of vast dangers invoked on its peoples. In order to neutralize mobile missiles it would be necessary to deal retaliative strikes of great yield at the supposed areas of their deployment. This is the real value of the United States' "concern" for the security of West Europeans. This is a grim fact, but it is a fact.

"The Soviet Union is not seeking preferential treatment. We insist on one thing only, that the United States and the NATO alliance as a whole should measure our security and the security of our allies by the same yardstick as their own. We see the objective of the coming talks in translating the principle of parity and equal security into the language of concrete commitments of the sides. The Soviet Union would like the talks to result in the lowering of the level of confrontation instead of raising this level, and in the road being opened to further steps for military detente in Europe."

We have already said that given the United States' reasonable stand in case NATO's plans of the missile armaments are dropped, we shall be prepared to reduce the aggregate number of Soviet missiles. I must add that we shall be prepared to agree on rather substantial reductions from both sides.

When the need to consider nuclear potentials of the United States' allies in NATO is the point of the matter we simply suggest taking into consideration what there exists. The Soviet Union is not pressing for the reduction of precisely these potentials. It is the overall result, overall balance that is important to us.

It is precisely for the purpose of making it easier to embark on the practical solution of the problem that we suggested, as we confirm it anew, imposing as soon as the talks start, that is from November 30 of this year, a moratorium on the deployment in Europe of new medium-range nuclear missile means of NATO and the USSR, the moratorium that would operate till the conclusion of a permanent treaty. This would mean that both sides would freeze quantitatively and qualitatively the plans of deploying their medium-range nuclear missile means in Europe including, naturally, U.S. forward-based nuclear means in the area, would stop the work on the preparation to implement such plans. NATO countries would not be deploying "Pershing-II" missiles, cruise missiles and other medium-range nuclear missile armaments. The Soviet Union would stop the deployment of SS-20 missiles.

Thus, the Soviet Union is saying a clear "yes" to any honest talks leading to the curbing of the arms race and genuine disarmament. We believe that such talks are necessary and realistic and we, on our part, will be promoting the attainment of their success.

Question: Under President Reagan the United States does not wish even to hear about the Salt-II treaty that had been drawn up earlier by Moscow and Washington. Do you believe in the reality of reviving that treaty?

Answer: When I am asked about the SALT-II treaty, I always recall those prolonged and not easy talks at different levels that preceded its conclusion. The treaty that had been worked out reflected the clearly defined balance of interests of the sides, everything has been weighed as on very fine scales. This is why the treaty was acceptable for both sides.

By the time of the conclusion of the treaty, the Soviet Union had a greater number of carriers, while the United States had the advantage as regards the number of warheads. But we agreed in case the treaty comes into effect to decrease the number of strategic weapon carriers by approximately ten percent or 25 units.

Establishing the parity of the USSR and the United States in the sphere of strategic offensive armaments, moreover through bigger cuts of such means by the Soviet Union than by the United States, the SALT II treaty was laying down a reliable basis for further measures in strategic arms limitation and reduction. This was promoted also by the rather rigid framework that was introduced for the work on designing the new types of missiles and perfecting old ones.

It is not our fault that the treaty, which is, perhaps, one of the most important of all the treaties on arms control, has not yet gone into effect.

It is attempted in Washington to justify the refusal to ratify the SALT II treaty by allegations that the United States lags behind the USSR, which already has or is about to acquire some major advantages in strategic armaments. But it is precisely the treaty that precluded the advantage of any of the sides once and for ever.

I must state quite definitely that from the moment when the SALT II treaty was signed in 1979 the Soviet Union has not been doing anything in the sphere of strategic armaments that would lead to changing that rough parity which has been established.

Meanwhile, the United States, quite the contrary, is adopting ever new military programmes. Fabulous sums are allocated for them. And all this is being done under the pretext of liquidating the United States' non-existent "lagging behind" the USSR. As to the SALT process, its continuation is being linked with the implementation of the programmes of increasing the United States' strategic might. It turns out that people in Washington are speaking not about the reduction of strategic armaments but their build-up, that the talks are being made dependent on the speed of the movement of the flowline of armaments.

The Soviet Union declares consistently for the continuation of the SALT process, for genuine limitations and reductions of strategic armaments on the basis of the principle of parity and equal security. What is needed for this purpose is to continue the talks calmly, without cheap propaganda and attempts at pressure, to preserve everything positive that has been achieved when drawing up the SALT II treaty, not to link in any way this priority problem with other problems, no matter how important.

Now a few words about control. They like to proclaim in Washington that agreements on arms limitation should render themselves to thorough control. But who objects to this? We, too, wish to be confident that the United States is fulfilling its obligations. Therefore, we are interested in control no less, and maybe more, than the United States.

It is in the United States that all sorts of plans are being discussed in earnest as to how intercontinental missiles could be hidden more reliably, could be placed beyond the control by national technical means. It is in the United States, not in the Soviet Union, that the variants of preemptive use of nuclear weapons with taking advantage of the effect of surprise are being played out. Our stand is the renunciation of being the first to use nuclear weapons. It is determined by our general attitude to nuclear war as an impermissible catastrophe.

We, just as the United States, have the experience of control over the SALT I agreements. We are confident that national means ensure due control. The resolving power of these means of observation, specifically, space means, is constantly increasing, hence the possibilities of national means of control are growing, too. The U.S. administration is well aware of this. Some other forms of control might be worked out, given confidence. But under all conditions national means must have the priority since they are better suited for the interests of security of a state.

It should not be allowed that the development of science and technology in the sphere of armaments gets ahead of the possibilities of control over the measures of arms limitation and reduction. This means that an arrangement to this effect is needed now. It is needed in order to stop the flow line of the arms race, to ensure the reduction of armaments under a reliable control in the interests of security of all peoples.

Question: The idea of further spread of confidence-building measures on our continent that you set out many times caused interest in the West. The Soviet Union is prepared to spread these measures to the entire European part of the country. What step is expected from the West in return?

Answer: The strengthening of confidence among states, particularly in the military sphere, meets the vital interests of the European peoples, of all participants in the all-European conference, including the United States and Canada. This cannot be otherwise since the road to peace passes not through confrontation but through the process of talks, through meetings and conferences of representatives of states, and, in the long run, through practical steps that help bring peoples closer together, normalize the international atmosphere, remove such obstacles as mutual distrust, prejudice and fear.

We in the Soviet Union would like to hope that the circumstantial and propaganda considerations by which some Western delegations are guided at the meeting in Madrid do not eclipse the fundamental requirements of cooperation and that it will be possible to achieve agreement on convening a European conference on confidence-building measures, security and disarmament in Europe. There can be no confidence without reciprocity and equality. International security is based on equal security of contracting parties.

Consenting to spread confidence-building measures to the entire European part of the USSR, we naturally expect reciprocal steps from the West. Military preparations in the European zone of NATO start now from the continential edge of Europe. Everybody knows this. Insular territories adjacent to Europe, respective sea and ocean areas and air space over them must, consequently, also be included. This is the point.

Question: Debates on nuclear-free zone have been launched in Europe again. What do you think of the creation of such zones in different areas of our continent?

Answer: You ask about nuclear-free zones. The importance of the creation of nuclear-free zones is evident to those who set in earnest the task of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and stabilisation of peace. And the road toward agreement, it seems to me, is not so thorny.

Indeed, many states have joined the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, most of them having no such weapons on their territories. There can hardly be any doubts that the majority of them treasure their non-nuclear status and would like to see in it a guarantee or not being drawn into a nuclear conflict. If nuclear powers assumed the commitment to respect the non-nuclear status of such states, not to deploy nuclear weapons on their territories and not to use nuclear weapons against them under any circumstances, the conditions for the creation of several nuclear-free zones would form simultaneously in various areas of the world.

I was recently addressed with a question from Finland as to what would be the Soviet Union's attitude to the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe. Our answer was given publicly and I shall not cite it in full. I shall only recall that the Soviet Union expressed the readiness by concluding a multilateral agreement with countries participating in the zone or agreements with each of them in particular to assume the commitment on non-use of nuclear weapons against northern Europe.

We are not making our commitment conditional upon the positive attitude of other nuclear powers to the zone though, naturally, the participants in the zone would be in greater security if the guarantees of the respect of the non-nuclear status were given also by NATO nuclear powers.

We do not rule out the possibility of discussing in the context of the creation of the north European nuclear-free zone the implementation of some measures on our own territory. Without going into detail, I shall note that it might be substantial measures.

The north of Europe is far from the only place in our continent where the possibility of the creation of nuclear-free zones is being intensively discussed. This idea is very popular in the Balkans. Many countries of the Mediterranean show interest in it. We, naturally, sympathise with such ideas.

The Soviet Union wishes that the arsenals of all types of nuclear weapons in Europe should not be widened, that instead the process of their reduction should be started. I shall end with what I started -- if a possibility of the creation of a nuclear-free zone opens in some or other part of Europe, the USSR will give the most intensive support to practical steps in this direction.

Question: The developments in Poland are assessed as a very serious matter in the FRG. Can it be surmised that the question of normalisation of the situation in Poland is viewed in the Soviet Union in a close connection with the preservation of peace in Europe?

Answer: Certainly, it is viewed in close connection with the preservation of peace, and, I would add, the place of socialist Poland in Europe.

There are a lot of speculations about Poland in the West, all sort of speculations having mostly one aim, that of destabilising further the situation, undermining the positions of socialism in that country, complicating Poland's relations with the Soviet Union, and to be sure, getting from all this advantages for the designs of the NATO bloc.

Certain persons cannot wait to impose on the peoples the hardships of cold war or some other war. The Soviet Union was never engaged and is not engaged in such affairs. Poland is to us a friend, a good neighbour and an ally and we treat it as an ally and friend should be treated. The USSR is trying to make it easier for the Poles to overcome economic difficulties and is assisting them in this, as far as our possibilities allow.

It would be good if they in the West understood that peace and tranquility are necessary for all states of Europe, and not only for countries of the socialist community.

[Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German on 2 November publishes on pages 34-63 the 8,000-word interview granted by CPSU General Secretary Brezhnev to a team of DER SPIEGEL editors in the Kremlin. The date of the interview is not given. Comparison with the above TASS English version reveals that the two versions are identical.]

SPANISH VOTE ON ENTRY INTO NATO CRITICIZED

LD311534 Moscow in Spanish to Spain 1900 GMT 30 Oct 81

[Talk by Yardslav Khabarov "A Pyrrhic Victory of the Atlanticists"]

[Text] The vote imposed by the government in the Congress of Deputies on entry into NATO ended in favor of the ruling party. Such an outcome is not unexpected taking into account the fact that the Union of the Democratic Center has a majority in the house. It was also predetermined because the Calvo-Sotelo government made great efforts to obtain approval by the lower house of the Cortes of the decision on the country's entry into NATO, a decision which is dangerous for Spanish sovereignty.

The supporters of the pro-atlantic course did not worry much about the weight of their arguments. Above all they were concerned with one problem: how to ensure that all the centrist deputies voted in favor of NATO entry. In Spain and abroad the pro-Atlantic forces organized and carried out a broad campaign deceiving the public outright. The Atlantic propagandists often did not lose the opportunity to distort or silence the facts.

An obvious example of this is the behavior of the majority of the newspapers and U.S. radio and television in resporting the visit by King Juan Carlos to the United States. There was a sterile attempt to present the Spanish king as an unconditional supporter of Spain's entry into NATO as the channel, basically, of all the theses which suit the United States on this question and on the mythical Soviet threat to Spain and the Spainards' agreement to the possible use of their country as a staging point for the rapid deployment imperialist police forces, and as a training camp for operations in the Middle East, etc. To deny this, Juan Carlos's retinue gave a special press conference at which the slanderers were denounced.

It would seem, then, that the result the Atlanticists wanted so much has at last been achieved. Parliament sanctioned the government's actions aimed at NATO entry. In the opinion of the supporters of the pro-Atlantic course, in the near future the Senate will ratify the decision which suits the government. So, the matter, it seems, is decided. But one might ask: at what price? Acting, they say, in the name of Spanish democracy and stating that NATO membership will definitively guarantee the democratic order in the country, the Atlantists actually clumsily violated the rules of democracy. When the considerable disagreement between the Spanish political parties and among all Spaniards regarding this important problem for the country's security became manifest, they did away with the possibility of consulting the people, of organizing a referendum to ask the Spaniards themselves for their opinion on the country's incorporation into the political-military bloc.

In the course of the debate, Prime Minister Calvo-Sotelo said that the fate of Spain is in any case linked to that of other Western countries, thus supposing that it is not obligatory to ask the Spaniards' opinion. Without having received a mandate for it in the elections or in a referendum, Prime Minister Calvo-Sotelo is dragging the country into a dangerous game. The risk of participating in it is disproportionate compared with the supposed advantages to NATO entry. The risk of a nuclear war spreading to Spanish territory will increase considerably. Spain's membership in NATO will impose ruinous complementary expenditure for military necessities on its people and, finally, with this step Spain upsets the balance existing between the blocs in Europe, as was clearly pointed out in the Soviet memorandum on Spain's entry into NATO.

The anti-Soviet attacks with which the prime minister attempted to justify the need for the decision are at least puzzling, especially compared with frequent official statements about Spain's desire to develop relations of good neighborliness with all countries of the world, among them, naturally, the USSR and its allies.

Spain's incorporation into NATO, which the country's present government supports, does not resolve many problems which the Atlanticists had promised to resolve when they insisted on this decision. An obvious example of this is the continuing problem of Gibraltar and the deadlock regarding the conditions for Spain's admission into the EEC which they had promised to settle to Spain's satisfaction before its entry into NATO.

Thus, with the votes of the centrists and the right, a dangerous decision for the cause of peace and international cooperation has been approved in Spain. Another dangerous seat of tension is appearing in Europe. This is happening, regrettably, at a time when the antiwar movement is growing throughout Europe. This decision will not bring peace to Spain. One can hardly expect the opponents of entry into NATO to agree to be dragged by force and under barefaced pressure into the dangerous military bloc. There is no doubt that their resistance will grow.

AWACS VIEWED IN CONTEXT OF U.S. MIDEAST POLICY

Intelligence for Israel

LD301944 Moscow TASS in English 1844 GMT 30 Oct 81

[By TASS observer Yuriy Trushin]

[Text] Moscow 30 Oct, TASS -- According to U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig, the U.S. administration is very much pleased with the outcome of the voting in the Senate on the question of deliveries of AWACS planes to Saudi Arabia. He holds that this decision will all but promote the strengthening of security of Middle Eastern states. Let these assertions remain on his conscience. We shall recall only some examples of the use of U.S. radioelectronic reconnaissance equipment in the Middle East.

During the latest Israeli-Egyptian wars of 1967 and 1973 Israel's General Staff was getting from the U.S. intelligence services important information on the deployment, movements and equipment of the Egyptian forces. The defeat of the Egyptian army on the Sinai in 1967, the fact that the Egyptians lost the chance to win in October 1973 when Israeli forces, using the information of the U.S. intelligence services dealt a counter-stroke on the Egyptian forces in the area of Deversuar, the Suez Canal, are still remembered in Egypt, and these memories are still painful.

Another example of the use of U.S. intelligence information by Israeli aggressors could be recalled -- the strike of Israeli bombers on the Iraqi centre of peaceful atomic research. Using the information of the CIA, of the U.S. reconnaissance with the use of radioelectronics, and earth satellites, Israeli planes stole over the area of the Iraqi atomic research centre and bombed it out. The much lauded AWACS systems deployed in Saudi Arabia surely registered the fact of the penetration of the air space of Saudi Arabia by planes that took part in the raid on Baghdad, but the Arab side was not informed of the fact.

It is quite possible to explain the "victory" of President Reagan in the Senate where he managed to ensure the passage of the bill on the sales to Saudi Arabia of a consignment of AWACS planes, the victory that is much publicized by the U.S. press.

The senators were explained the multi-purpose character of large deliveries of weapons to Saudi Arabia. Without damaging the present U.S.-Israeli ties, these deliveries will gear Riyadh to the notorious Camp David collusion that has been rejected by Arab countries.

It is indicative that President Reagan hastened to assure Israel that the deliveries of AWACS planes to Saudi Arabia will not affect in any way the U.S.-Israeli relations.

A paradoxical situation has formed: The U.S. administration is trying to persuade Arabs, above all Egypt and Saudi Arabia that they are much in need of AWACS planes for defence and security, while it is making assurances to real aggressors, Israel, occupying Arab lands and constantly threatening its neighbours, that AWACS planes will be neither a threat nor a hindrance to it.

Threat to Arabs

LD301810 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic to the Arab World 1630 GMT 30 Oct 81

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] The U.S. Congress has approved the sale of five espionage AWACS planes to Saudi Arabia. This act ends a long theatrical play of information put on to conceal Riyadh's involvement in implementing the designs of the United States and Israel against the Arabs.

Discussions over the consequences of the deal continued for 9 long months in Congress between the alleged opponents of the AWACS sale to Riyadh and the proponents of the sale. The rulers of Israel, and even the British Conservatives, participated in the controversy. They all tried to create the impression that the sale of the AWACS to Saudi Arabia really changes the balance of power in the Middle East in favor of the Arabs, and that it was a test of an alleged rational policy being pursued by the United States in the Middle East, which, as is well-known, does not exist in reality.

The fact is that the deal is no more than a screen to cover up military preparations which the United States is making against the Arabs aimed at transforming the Wahhabi Kingdom [Saudi Arabia] into a source of threat to the entire Islamic world.

President Reagan's message to Howard Baker, leader of the Republican majority in the Senate, attempting to justify the deal, provides the best proof of this. The message contained the clear admission that the AWACS sale to Riyadh benefits, first and foremost, the United States and the Israeli aggressors. The message also pointed out that Washington has obtained undertakings from Riyadh to permit the stationing of American military forces in Saudi Arabia until 1990 under the pretext of training Saudi experts to service the AWACS planes. The American President considers this to be a factor that will enable the United States to influence Saudi Arabia's foreign policy for a long time to come and make it serve Israel's interests.

The conditions of the sale prevent Riyadh from providing any of the Arab countries with any information gathered by the AWACS plane, but they commit Saudi Arabia to supplying such information to Washington -- a matter which would enable the Washington administration to spy on the Arab countries adjoining Saudi Arabia, as well as Iran, and to share with Israel information about the military capabilities of these countries.

The operational range of the AWACS has been restricted to Saudi Arabia, thereby preventing the observation of Israel's aggressive military preparations. Washington has reserved for itself the right to use these planes outside Saudi Arabia when it becomes necessary to mount American military operations against the countries which pursue a policy opposed to imperialism.

It is recalled that two AWACS planes recently flew over the Egyptian-Libyan and Sudanese-Libyan borders for this specific purpose. Furthermore, the treacherous raid on the Iraqi nuclear reactor indicates that the flying radars in Saudi skies could be used by Israel to deal preemptive blows on the Arab countries.

The sale of the AWACS planes to Riyadh is part of the imperialist pressure which the United States brings to bear on the Arab countries and which assumed unprecedented dimensions with the coming to power of the Reagan administration. Never in history has there been a time when there was such domination of the policies of the Arab countries and the destinies of their peoples as Washington now has. This dangerous game will only help increase the dangers of new conflicts developing in the Arab Gulf region and a new war in the Middle East.

Riyadh's acquisition of the AWACS has nothing to do with strengthening internal security and stability in Saudi Arabia because, on the contrary, it undermines them. The AWACS planes would not be able to notify the Saudi royal palace and alert it to the actions which the strugglers, whose numbers are definitely growing, prepare to decisively end Saudi Arabia's subservience to Washington. At the same time, it will be difficult for the Saudi ruling circles to deny the charges that they accept occupation of the cradle of Islam by the mentors of the Israeli aggressors.

MOTIVES OF U.S. MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN MIDEAST

Sinai 'Multinational Forces'

LD011720 Moscow TASS in English 1655 GMT 1 Nov 81

[By TASS commentator Igor Myakishev]

[Text] Moscow, 1 Nov, TASS -- The United States is exerting strong pressure on its West European allies in a bid to force them to play at least a token role in the so-called "multi-national forces" for the Sinai, which are being put together by the Camp David partners to monitor the observance of the separate deal by Egypt and Israel with regard to the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Sinai Peninsula planned for April 1982.

The "multi-national" camouflage is needed by Washington to step up its own military presence on sovereign Egytpian territory. For instance, the United States is trying to secure control over two major military bases that are to be vacated on the peninsula by Israel, and also access for its warships to the Sharm ash-Shaykh port under the "multi-national flag" of the Sinai contingent.

What all this amounts to is the substitution of American occupation for Israeli and the restriction of Egypt's sovereignty over its own territory.

Many observers view the units that the Pentagon is going to station on the Sinai as the advance guard of the Rapid Deployment Forces set up to carry out interventionist operations in various regions, primarily the Middle East.

In this way the United States is trying to secure for itself the long awaited possibility to deploy its armed forces in the Middle East on a long-term basis, which fully meets the aspirations of U.S. imperialism to establish dominance over that strategically sensitive part of the world.

In this context the intention of a number of West European countries to knuckle under the Washington's diktat is strongly criticised in the Arab world.

The fact that certain West European countries have stated their intention to participate in the "multi-national forces" on the Sinai, says an official Syrian statement, is a serious deviation in their course, facilitates the implementation of the Camp David seal, grossly impinges on the vital interests of the Arab nations and contravenes the striving for dialogue between Western Europe and the Arab countries. Thatis why the Syrian Government decided to raise this question at the forthcoming Arab summit so that the Arab countries should determine their position with regard to those states which were to participate in the "multi-national forces."

In view of this new direction in the policies of the West European countries, their role in the search for a comprehensive and just peace in the Middle East should be neutralized because participation in the "multi-national forces" places the European states at the service of the Camp David deal, which has been rejected by the Arab nations, the statement stressed.

Exercises in Egypt

LD302258 Moscow World Service in English 1400 GMT 30 Oct 81

[By Moscow radio commentator Vladimir Korotkov]

[Text] Large-scale American military exercises are to be held in Egypt near the eastern border of Libya early next month. Washington makes no secret of the fact that this saber rattling is meant first of all to intimidate disobedient Libya. During the exercises, the heavy American bombers will actually turn a big territory along the border with Libya into a scorched land, and then 5,000 airborne troops will land in the area.

Look and fear — such is the message that the United States wants to get across not only to Libya, but to the Egyptian people as well. The United States wants to keep Egypt and its Trojan horse in the Arab world at all costs. And at the same time, without a shade of embarrassment, the American press says that the CIA is preparing the assassination of the Libyan leader Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, and that small Libya is allegedly threatening the vital interests of the United States.

Washington claims that the sphere of its vital interests spreads actually all over the globe: the Persian Gulf, the Middle East, the Indian Ocean, Western Europe and the whole of Asia, Africa and Latin America. To protect those interests the United States organizes assassinations of political leaders, holds intimidating military exercises in different parts of the world and crudely interferes in internal affairs of countries. What is more, it is ready to place the entire nations [as heard] and even the whole planet on the brink of a nuclear war.

The Soviet leader, Leonid Brezhnev, has pointed out that never before the international policy and the future of whole nations of all continents has been manipulated so cynically and with such outright (?enemyism) as it was done today by the aggressive forces of imperialism. [sentence as heard]

There is the tragedy of Chile where the people had to pay with their blood and freedom for the desire to decide for themselves their future and to dispose of their wealth. There is the assassination of the leader of Panama, Omar Torrijos, and of the outstanding African leader Patrice Lumumba. There were also attempts on the life of Fidel Castro. The responsibility for all these acts rests with the American CIA.

For Washington the words vital interests have become an excuse for any sort of crime, vandalism, interference and pressure. The United States places weapons into the hands of the Afghan bandits, who plunder, kill and commit other acts of violence. The United States has drowned in blood the much-suffered land of El Salvador. It is plotting against Iran and training mercenaries to invade Cuba, Nicaragua and Grenada. Washington is putting open pressure on the new government of Greece in order to keep its bases in the country. It encourages the South African racists in staging acts of aggression against the African people and spreads its protective wing over the Israeli militarists.

That is a dangerous course and it can have very serious consequences for the future of people and of peace.

PRAVDA REVIEWS CURRENT SITUATION IN EGYPT

PM300947 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 81 p 5

[Correspondent V. Peresada dispatch: "Arrests in Egypt"]

[Text] Cairo, 26 Oct — Arrests of members of the religious organization which, according to official reports, was involved in As-Sadat's assassination and the clashes in Asyut, are continuing. A communique from the Ministry of the Interior states that a number of the organization's strongholds in Cairo were recently "rendered harmless." As a result of roundup carried out in the regions of al-Ma'adi and Jamaliyah (the city's poorest and most populous region), several of the organization's leaders were seized and a large quantity of weapons and explosives and foreign currency in U.S. dollars was confiscated. The police operations were accompanied by a fierce exchange of fire and there are casualties on both sides. According to the communique, the total number of "extremists" arrested since the attack on As-Sadat has risen to 397.

Together with the "normalization" of the internal situation, steps are being taken to continue the "Camp David process." Egyptian Foreign Minister K. 'Ali has gone to Israel, where he will have talks with President Y. Navon and Prime Minister M. Begin.

U.S. AWACS aircraft are now continuing to patrol the regions adjacent to the border with Libya. At the same time, Egyptian Defense Minister M. Abu Ghazalah stated yesterday that "complete calm" persists on the Egyptian-Libyan border. This admission in fact refutes numerous allegations by both the Americans and the Egyptians themselves that Libya is nurturing some sort of "aggressive designs."

Meanwhile for the first time the press here is criticizing, albeit indirectly, U.S. political methods in the Near East. A. Mansur, chief editor of the weekly OCTOBER, calls on Washington "not to compromise regimes friendly to the United States" and not to present them in the role of "U.S. agents." Otherwise the people's hostility toward these regimes and toward the United States increases, the author notes, recalling that weapons were no help to the shah of Iran when the people refused him their support.

SOVIET-ALGERIAN TRADE, COOPERATION OUTLINED

LD310104 Moscow TASS in English 1758 GMT 30 Oct 81

[Text] Moscow, 30 Oct, TASS -- Commercial and economic relations between the Soviet Union and the Algerian People's Democratic Republic are being built on the basis of equality and mutual advantage. Bilateral trade is being developed dynamically. A TASS correspondent was told at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade that over the first six months of the current year, the total volume of trade between the USSR and the Algerian People's Democratic Republic increased 50 percent on the same period last year to make up 87.9 million roubles. The Soviet import from Algeria rose by over 60 percent. Such a large increase of purchases by Soviet foreign trade organizations from Algeria is an important factor stimulating further successful development of Algeria's industry.

The bulk of Soviet export to Algeria is constituted by various machinery and equipment, metal cutting tools, equipment for plants producing pig iron, steel and rolled metal, oil and oil products.

Besides that, the USSR supplies to the friendly republic building materials, medicines. In its turn, the Soviet Union imports from Algeria pig iron, cork and cork chips, farm produce, juices and wines, many Algerian staple exports.

The economic cooperation between the two countries develops fruitfully. Altogether 150 wells were sunk in the desert on the Algerian territory with Soviet economic and technological cooperation, several dams were built. More than one hundred projects have been completed or are being completed. They include the second section of the metallurgical complex in El-Hadjar. Its capacity has been increased to about two million tons of steel a year. This plant will be meeting about half of the republic's needs in metal. The question of building the second, a bigger metallurgical complex in the west of the country is being discussed. Its capacity is planned to be up to ten million tons of steel a year.

A glass mill in Oranuza power station in Annaba, a mercury producing plant "Ismail" in Azzaba, a lead and zinc mine and a dressing factory in El-Abeda were built in Algeria with the participation of Soviet building organizations and operate effectively. Soviet and Algerian geologists discovered in Algeria the biggest deposit of mercury in Africa and also new deposits of iron ore, tungsten, tin, gold and other minerals.

An important branch of Soviet-Algerian economic cooperation is the construction of projects of water conservancy. Representatives of the USSR State Committee for External Economic relations and corresponding organizations of Algeria are conducting negotiations about the construction in Algeria with Soviet assistance of four new irrigation dams that will make it possible to bring water to vast areas and to turn uncultivated arid lands into fertile lands.

PRAVDA REPORTS SOCIAL SCIENCE CONFERENCE

PM301657 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 81 pp 1-2

[TASS report: "Forming Ideological Conviction"]

[Text] Questions linked with the further improvement of the teaching of social sciences, the communist education of student youth, and the development of research into the topical problems of Marxist-Leninist theory in light of the 26th CPSU Congress decisions were the focus of attention of the all-union conference of social sciences departments chiefs which opened on 14 October in the Great Kremlin Palace.

Taking part in its work are chiefs of CPSU Central Committee sections, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, secretaries and science and educational establishments section chiefs of union republic communist parties, and kraykoms and obkoms, scientists, leading workers of ministries and departments, and reactors and party organization secretaries of the country's leading VUZes.

The conference was opened by M.V. Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

An honorary presidium comprising the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee headed by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev was unanimously elected.

A speech was delivered by M.A. Suslov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, who was warmly greeted by those assembled.

V.P. Yelyutin, USSR minister of higher and secondary specialized education, delivered a report entitled "The 26th CPSU Congress and the Tasks of Social Sciences Departments." On behalf of the multimillion-strong collective of the country's VUZes, he expressed heartfelt thanks to the CPSU Central Committee and Comrade L.I. Brezhnev for their constant concern for the higher school, for their high assessment of the activity of the teachers of social sciences and their warm words of greetings.

The VUZ collectives, which joined in with great enthusiasm the nationwide struggle to fulfill the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, the speaker said, have a firm basis for the successful implementation of the party's plans. Over 5 million students are studying and half a million teachers and scientific assistants are performing teaching and scientific research work at the 890 VUZes operating in the country. In the period since the 25th party congress the standard of cadres' training has improved tangibly, 32 new universities and institutes have been opened, and a vast program for improving the content, organization and structure of higher education has been implemented.

The basis of all the higher school's activity is the scientific leadership of its development effected by the CPSU. Implemented in accordance with the congress decisions, the program for the development of higher education is aimed primarily at the further improvement of the quality of cadres training, and the consolidation of the link between the VUZes and production. The main thing, the most important thing in the work of the higher school in the eighties is to safeguard the training and education of specialists capable of resolving successfully the problems of enhancing the efficiency of the national economy.

In the time which has elapsed since the previous all-union conference, the higher school has taken a major step forward in improving the specialists' communist education. The establishment of an integral system for the continuous teaching and study of the theory of Marxism-Leninism has been basically completed. Guided by the complex approach toward educational work, the VUZ teachers and public organizations have stepped up their concern for the young people's ideological and political, labor and moral education and have enriched educational practice with effective new forms and methods. An important factor in improving the system of the specialists' communist education has been the further improvement of the qualifications of social sciences department teachers.

At the same time, the speaker continued, the standard and effectiveness of activity in the sphere of specialists' Marxist-Leninist education and training still do not fully accord with the party's increased requirements and the needs of the practice of communist building. The main reason for shortcomings should be seen in the poor consideration of new conditions and circumstances in Soviet people's lives, the poor use of the enormous arsenal of means of education which the party has elaborated and which have been verified in its political educational activity. All this sets the great task of the all-round improvement of the forms and methods of educating the student youth which have taken shape and the creative development of new forms.

The new stage of the aggravation of the ideological struggle in the world arena places the system of communist education in a special situation. The galvanization of the reactionary circles' provocative activity aimed at ideological infiltration of Soviet youth obliges social sciences departments to further enhance the effectiveness of propaganda and counterpropaganda among the student body. We must not forget for a minute that the sphere of education and training has now become the arena for a very acute clash between the opposing socioeconomic systems, where a struggle is underway for the main thing -- for man -- and it is man who is the supreme goal and asset of communism.

The report described in detail the main avenues for improving the activity of VUZ social sciences departments and above all questions of improving the ideological and theoretical standard of the teaching of Marxist-Leninist theory.

Over 4 million specialists will be trained by the higher school in the 11th 5-Year Plan, the minister said in conclusion. Those who are sitting on the students' bench today will go to work in an exceptionally important period in the country's life when, as Comrade L.I. Brezhnev pointed out at the congress, the national economic structure with which our fatherland will enter the new millenium will be created. That is why this should be the most progressive, most trained, most convinced generation of the Soviet intelligentsia. It is from precisely these standpoints that the VUZ teaching collectives must approach and are approaching student youth's communist education.

V.P. Yelyutin assured the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo and Comrade L.I. Brezhnev that the professors and teachers, students and all workers of the higher school, monolithically rallied around the Communist Party, will ensure the consistent and unswerving fulfillment of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and will boost the quality of the specialists' training and communist education to the standard of the party's increased demands.

The conference is continuing its work.

GORSHKOV WRITES IN IZVESTIYA ON CRIMEAN BATTLE

LD310830 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0200 GMT 30 Oct 81

[Text] Today is the 40th anniversary of the beginning of the heroic defense of Sevastopol. It has gone down in the history of the Great Patriotic War as an outstanding example of mass heroism, protracted and active defense, and skillful cooperation between Army, Navy and Air Force.

Sevastopol is a bulwark of Russian military glory, Admiral of the Soviet Navy Gorshkov writes in IZVESTIYA. This town has had to pass difficult combat examinations more than once. From its very foundation it has been a key position of the fatherland Navy in the Black Sea. The defenders of Sevastopol fought selflessly. In the period of the war which was the most difficult for our homeland they immobilized considerable enemy forces in the Crimea. The Soviet people has rightly named Sevastopol a hero city.

IZVESTIYA EDITORIALIZES ON 9-MONTH PLAN FIGURES

FM301545 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Oct 81 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Making Thirfty Use of Resources"]

[Excerpt] The USSR Central Statistical Administration report on the results of our industry's work in the first 9 months of 1981 has just been published. It notes that socialist industry has secured a further growth in production and improvement in technical and economic indicators. The plan for the total volume of output has been fulfilled. The increase in industrial production compared with the corresponding period last year was 3.3 percent. Labour productivity increased 2.6 percent, which accounted for more than four-fifths of the increase in output. Output prime cost decreased and profits increased.

The industry of all union republics coped with the plan. The majority of industrial ministries also fulfilled the state targets. The collectives of the sectors extracting gas and producing chemical plant-protection agents, agricultural machines and machines for stockraising and fodder production, instruments, means of automation and computer equipment, sewn goods, furniture, high-grade crockery and clocks and watches worked particularly successfully. The high results in these sectors were achieved primarily thanks to precise production and labor organization, the skillful retooling and modernization of existing enterprises and shops, a purposeful struggle to improve output quality and the intensification of the policy of economy and thrift.

Unfortunately, it was not possible to achieve such results everywhere. Certain associations and enterprises failed to fulfill the plans in terms of total volume of output, increased labor productivity, decreased output prime cost and accumulations or the targets of scientific and technical programs. These omissions had an adverse impact on the balanced development of the economy.

Everything in our complex multisectorial economy is interconnected and interdependent. That is why it is important to adjust perfectly every link in this complex chain, to eliminate shortcomings more swiftly and to bring all sectors of industry and all associations and enterprises up to the level of the leading collectives. Meanwhile, the USSR Central Statistical Administration reports that the 9-month plan has not been fulfilled in terms of coal extraction or the production of finished rolled ferrous metal products, sulfuric acid, chemical fibers and yarns and certain other types of output. Production associations and enterprises of the Ministry of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry, the Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building, the Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry, the Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper and Wood Processing Industry and the Ministry of Light Industry failed to deliver output in full to consumers in accordance with the concluded contracts and adopted schedules.

Reserves for improving the efficiency and quality of work exist in all sectors, and in every labor collective. In the coal industry, for instance, the movement to achieve a daily extraction of at least 1,000 tons of fuel from comprehensively mechanized faces is well known for its great effectiveness. Today "thousanders" mine more than 40 percent of coal and shale, yet only 13 percent of all underground workers are employed in these collectives. It is not hard to calculate what the more widespread dissemination of this wonderful experience would produce in the sector.

There are many similar reserves in other sectors of industry. They must be more boldly utilized. "The intensification of the economy," Comrade L.I. Brezhnev noted at the 26th CPSU Congress, "and the improvement of its efficiency, to translate the formula into the language of practical action, consist primarily of ensuring that the results of production increase more rapidly than the outlay on it, and that it is possible to achieve more while involving comparatively fewer resources in production. Planning, and scientific and technical and structural policy must be subordinated to resolving this task. Economic management methods and policy in the administration sphere must also make for efficiency."

The task is clear, and precise ways of resolving it have been defined. There can be no doubt that industrial workers will demote all their strength, skill and enthusiasm to ensuring the absolute fulfillment of the plan for the first year of the 11th 5-Year Plan and will provide the country with more excellent-quality output.

The CPSU Central Committee October slogan is a militant action program for workers collectives:

"Working people of the Soviet Union! Improve labor productivity, efficiency and quality in every workplace!"

USSR WILL 'SQUEEZE ECONOMY' FOR MILITARY ENDS

PM301601 London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 30 Oct 81 p 4

[Nigel Wade dispatch: "Russia May 'Squeeze' Economy"]

[Text] Moscow -- Russian officials are prepared to squeeze their economy for military ends, according to British MP's visiting Moscow.

Concern for Soviet national security in the light of President Reagan's policies on arms was expressed by Mr Vasiliy Kuznetsov, Soviet first vice-president, said Mr John Osborn, conservative MP for Hallam, Sheffield, who is leading a inter-party parliamentary group.

Mr Peter Temple-Morris, a member of the Conservative Foreign Affairs Committee, and MP for Leominster, said that officals seemed greatly concerned that the United States would try to crack the Soviet economy in an arms race.

"There is a desperate concern about this," he said, "and at the same time there is a patriotic determination that, if they felt really pushed, they would be prepared to go as far as they could further to squeeze their economy for military ends."

Members of the visiting group said they found Soviet officials deeply worried about Poland but reluctant to intervene.

"I think it was clear that they have no wish whatsoever to invade Poland," said Mr Temple-Morris.

DOLGIKH, OTHERS ATTEND COAL INDUSTRY CONFERENCE

PM301403 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 81 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Conference of Coal Industry Workers"]

[Text] A conference of coal industry workers was held in Moscow on 14 October and discussed tasks stemming from the decisions of the 26th party congress, Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's instructions on questions of the further development of the fuel and energy complex, and the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions on accelerating the retooling of mines and increasing coal extraction by the opencut method.

B.F. Bratchenko, USSR minister of the coal industry, delivered the report at the conference.

A large group of workers, specialists and party and economic workers took part in the report's discussion.

The conference noted that the party and government are paying tremendous attention to the buildup of the country's fuel and energy potential. Recent CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions aimed at the further development of the coal industry and the raising and improvement of wages and the improvement of miners' working and daily living conditions have met with warm approval among the collectives of working people of the sector's enterprises and organizations. In response to the concern of the party and government, the miners are seeking new reserves for improving the efficiency of the work of mines and pits.

The conference expressed concern at the fact that some mines, pits, plants and construction sites are failing to fulfill the plan targets and are not making full use of fixed capital and are introducing new equipment only slowly.

It was stressed that the improvement of the management of production, the efficient use of equipment, machinery and mechanisms, the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, and the broad dissemination of advanced experience are the most important business for the labor collectives, party, trade union and Komsomol organizations and all working people of the coal industry.

Having discussed the tasks facing the coal industry, those taking part in the conference defined measures for improving work. The conference was addressed by CPSU Central Committee Secretary V.I. Dolgikh.

Taking part in the work of the conference were I.V. Kapitonov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; A. K. Antonov, V.E. Dymshits and K.F. Katushev, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers; the secretaries of the central committees of the communist parties of a number of union republics, of kraykoms, obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms, and of enterprise party committees; USSR ministers, leaders of production associations, mines, pits, construction sites and organizations, leading coal industry production workers, and soviet, trade union, and Komsomol workers.

Those taking part in the conference sent a letter to the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, USSR Council of Ministers and Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and adopted an appeal to all working people of the sector.

NEW GAS DEPOSIT DISCOVERED IN TURKMENIA

LD011708 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 1 Nov 81

[Text] Ashkhabad, 1 Nov, TASS -- The Dauletabad-Donmez gas deposit in the Karakum Desert (Soviet Turkmenia) has shattered the common belief that natural gas only accumulates in the higher up layers of the earth crust. Rich deposits of that hydrocarbon have now been found in layers of sand gently sloping towards one side. The gas deposit which has now been surveyed spreads over more than 2,500 square kilometres at a comparatively small depth of 3.5 kilometres.

"The presence of gas and oil in places where there are no conventional closed traps has never been recorded either in the USSR or abroad", Mirzakhan Mirzakhanov, Turkmenia's chief geologist, said. "The Dauletabad-Donmez deposit gives grounds for conducting survey not only in the closed local elevations but also far beyond their boundaries. Geological structures which are similar to that deposit are found in other parts of the Karakum Desert as well."

BRIEFS

COAL EXTRACTION -- The last tons of this year's coal plan have been obtained at the 60th Anniversary of the Lenin Komsomol coalmine, which is part of the production association Gukovugol in Donbas. This is one of the largest coalmines in the country, with a capacity of 3 million tons of anthracite a year. It came into operation only recently. The plan for this year's plan envisages the extraction of 1.5 million tons of coal. This objective has been reached ahead of schedule due to successful mastering of composite mining technology. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 31 Oct 81 LD]

UKRAINE NUCLEAR POWERPLANT -- A new nuclear powerplant with a capacity of 4 million kw is being built in the southern Ukraine. It is expected that this plant will begin to supply energy to the country and the neighboring socialist republics by 1986. This new plant will not damage the environment. The nuclear powerplants built in the Soviet Union in the last 10 years have not harmed the environment or people. [Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1900 GMT 27 Oct 81 GF]

RADIO REPORTS AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS 30 OCT

LD310340 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 30 October. Times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

Kazakhstan farmers are now concentrating on finishing the harvest and procuring sugar beet, vegetables, cotton and other late crops. Almost 18 million hectares of fallow have been plowed in readiness for the sowing of summer crops which is 95 percent of the planned area. (1430 GMT)

Autumn work is coming to an end on the fields in Altayskiy Kray. Collective farms and state farms have fulfilled the plan for autumn plowing and a total of 4.8 million hectares have been prepared for spring sowing. (1600 GMT)

APN OBSERVER INTERVIEWED ON AGRICULTURE

LD311100 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 30 Oct 81

[Unidentified correspondent's interview with APN economic observer Vladimir Gurevich -- questions and answers read by announcers]

[Text] [Question] Recently, newspapers in the West have had a lot to say about what they described as a crop failure in the Soviet Union. What do you think of that?

[Answer] As a matter of fact, harvesting is still in progress in several parts of the country, so the final results are not yet in. But it is true that this year has been a difficult one for Soviet farmers because large areas of the country were affected by severe drought. Nevertheless, we have statistics that over the first 9 months of the year, production of meat rose by 1 percent, the same as milk production, over the same period of last year. That may not be a very dramatic increase but it was in proportion to the population growth rate. What is more, even despite the drought, retail food prices here have remained stable. Meat, milk, butter and bread today cost just as much as they used to about 20-25 years ago. On the other hand, farms affected by the drought have received all the necessary relief aid, so that none of them have gone broke, so to speak, or been left stranded.

[Question] Now how bad was this drought?

[Answer] Well, a friend of mine who is a correspondent recently visited the southern Ukraine, which is one of our leading farming regions. He tells me that the drought there, with not a drop of rain, continued for more than 2 months. In another major farming area, the Povolzhye, that's the Volga Region, the heatwave arrived in the middle of May and ended only in late August. Daytime temperatures over this period reached 38 and 40 degrees centigrade and there was also not a drop of rain.

[Question] The reason I asked you about these things is that Western propaganda claims that we in the Soviet Union always blame our farming problems on bad weather.

[Answer] Well, I don't think we make any secret of the fact that we do have problems in our farming. We also specify the reasons for them, such as inadequate farming methods in many places. The lack of good access roads and also the inferior quality of many of our farm machines, which fail to meet the present-day requirements of our farmers. We also point to the considerable losses during harvesting and storage of farm products. I could continue listing these shortcomings but there is no denying the fact the weather does play the key role in any national farming. Suffice it to recall the severe drought in West Europe 5 years ago, or last year's drought in the United States, which was described as a climatic catastrophe. We have been plagued by bad weather during all these years. Here are some statistics. Since the start of the century we have been having droughts in European Russia, which is our main farming region, once in every 2 and 1/2 years.

Suffice it to say that 40 percent of all our arable land is located in the arid regions of this country. Fifty percent of our arable acreage is located in regions of high-risk farming as they are often described and only 1 percent of our arable acreage is located in areas with enough natural precipitation.

[Question] But then, why is farming being developed in the areas which have such bad climate?

[Answer] We often tried to develop farm production in areas with a better climate of course, but these areas have other problems, including poor soil, swamps, forest and so on, and many of these areas have a low percentage of people engaged in farm production. You must also bear in mind that vast areas of the country are occupied by deserts and semideserts. More than half of all Soviet territory is located in a cold climate which is totally unsuitable for many crops. We have large areas of permafrost, for example, and I think only people in the northern parts of Canada really know what this means in practice.

[Question] Can you compare our natural conditions with those in Western countries?

[Answer] Yes, I think I can, because there is one general yardstick for making such comparisons. This common yardstick is described as the bioclimatic potential and it includes the amount of rainfall, general humidity, the quality of soil, the mean annual temperature and other similar factors. So this bioclimatic potential or index in the Soviet Union is 1 and 1/2 times lower than in Great Britain, 2 times lower than in France and nearly 2 and 1/2 times lower than in the United States. It is enough to say that areas which we consider quite good for farming would be seen by American farmers as areas with an arid climate. What is more, farmers in the United States have no winter as compared with the Russian winters.

[Question] But climate in general is a more or less stable factor and we all know that at the beginning of this century, Russia used to be a leading exporter of grain; in fact, Russia sold more grain than the United States did.

[Answer] Yes, this is so. Russia, before the revolution, accounted for a quarter of the world exports of grain. But at the same time, as many as 13 million of the people of Russia, one-fifth of our total population, were starving. In the twenties, hunger assumed a truly disastrous scale here and in the spring of 1922, a total of 1 million people starved to death or died — that is, they were wiped out by disease resulting from the terrible shortages of food. Today, even when we have our worst crop failures in the Soviet Union, no one here dies of starvation. We are self-sufficient in bread and bread products. Even a relatively small grain harvest is really enough to meet in full our domestic bread requirements. But we do have a shortage of fodder and this affects the general food structure. By the food calories value, the Soviet Union ranks with some of the leading countries in the world, but the share of meat and dairy products in our ration is less than we would like it to be. But as compared with old Russia, the situation now is really quite different. Today, an average Soviet family consumes nearly three times more meat than an average family in old Russia.

[Question] But still, in all, farm efficiency here is lower than in many other countries, as far as I know.

[Answer] Yes, you're right on the whole, but the lag is not so great as one could imagine. If you compare crops yields in West Europe and in the United States, (?with) the crop yield in the parts of the Soviet Union with a comparable climate, the picture would be as follows. Our crop yields are somewhat lower than the advanced European countries but they are higher than in the United States. Incidentally, one Robert Bergland, the former agriculture secretary in the Carter administration, visited on arid region in Soviet Kazakhstan. He had to admit that American farmers could not raise such crops under such conditions.

[Question] Well, that means that we've achieved a lot in our rather specific conditions.

[Answer] Without a doubt, and in some areas, such as plant selection, we have achievements which enjoy general recognition. Again, I'd like to refer to Robert Bergland, who planted a Soviet brand of wheat on his own farm and achieved a marked increase in crop yields. So on his visit to this country, he asked for improved Soviet varieties. The Soviet Union is the world's leading producer of wheat and cotton. It accounts for 28 percent of world output of potatoes and for 31 percent of the sugar beet output. We are already abreast with with the United States in volume of energy consumption in farming by area of irrigated farming and by the production of chemical fertilizers. We are considerably ahead of the United States in the production of tractors, harvesting combines and other farm machines and we have large numbers of cattle.

[Question] But probably the numbers are not really of decisive importance?

[Answer] Yes, you are quite right, the emphasis is now on quality.

[Question] And what about budget expenditures on farming in the Soviet Union?

[Answer] Well, over the past 5 years, more than $250 billion have been channelled into our farming and I deliberately quote this figure in dollars and not in roubles at the official rate of exchange. Today, allocations into farming exceed one-quarter of all our spendings on national economy.

[Question] Yes, the scale of these expenditures is really impressive, but the final effect obviously still leaves room for improvement.

[Answer] Yes, this is correct, but we have to bear in mind, for example, that because of our climate, we in the Soviet Union have to spend three times more in labor and resources than farmers in the United States to produce the same amount of grain. For example, in the case of many other products this multiplication factor, so to speak, reaches the value of 6, which means that we in this country have to spend 6 times more on labor and resources than in most other countries in order to produce a comparable amount of farm produce and in comparison with such countries as Australia and New Zealand, this factor reaches the value of 10.

[Question] But is it reasonable to expect that we in the Soviet Union will be able to make our farm production more weather-independent?

[Answer] If you look at our mean annual crop yield, you will observe that this is already taking place now. One very important factor in this respect is land improvement. We already invest lots of money into land improvement now and these allocations will continue to grow. On the other hand, the land improvement measures in some cases failed to produce the expected effect. But still, in all, 1 hectare of land under irrigation farming produced six times greater crop yield than without irrigation. And in conclusion, I'd like to say that even despite the severe drought of this year, many Soviet farms have achieved good results. This gives us grounds for optimism and has proved that despite all the freaks of weather, despite the bad climate, we shall be able to boost farm production and make it more stable.

BREZHNEV CONGRATULATES BRYANSKAYA OBLAST WORKERS

LD010220 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 31 Oct 81

[Text] Leonid Ilich Brezhnev has sent a telegram to the leaders of Bryanskaya Oblast, Comrades (Sizenko) and (Poruchkevo), congratulating the working people on their fulfillment of pledges for selling potatoes to the state and on their considerable overfulfillment of the plan for supplying potatoes to Moscow and other industrial centers. The telegram stresses that by persistently implementing the party line for intensification of agriculture, Bryanskaya Oblast has become one of the largest potato producers in the country in recent years. Comrade Brezhnev wished the working people of the oblast new successes in the development of agriculture and other branches of the economy.